

SOCIAL INNOVATORS

AND

THEIR SCHEMES.

BY WILLIAM LUCAS SARGANT,

AUTHOR OF "THE SCIENCE OF SOCIAL OPULENCE," ETC.

LONDON:

SMITH, ELDER AND CO., 65, CORNHILL.

1858.

(The Right of Translation is reserved.)

PREFACE.

THE present generation is distinguished by an honourable desire to promote the well-being of the most numerous, and least fortunate, classes of society. If there is a certain amount of trading philanthropy mixed up with the genuine sentiment, that is only the "tribute which vice pays to virtue." We may say of such hypocrisy, as Pope said of another base passion:

"Envy will merit like its shade pursue,
But like the shadow, proves its substance true."

But this feeling of kind consideration for our fellows, is in some danger of leading men into errors. Young men, in particular, struck with some examples of hardship or injustice; deeply wounded by the spectacle of retiring merit overshadowed, or of poverty trampled upon by the insolent rich; seeing brawny arms without work, and innocent children wanting their daily bread; rush over-hastily to the conclusion, that a social organization which permits such evils, is unworthy to be

maintained: and argue that to suppose correction impossible, is to blaspheme our Maker.

The same sentiments of humanity, the same sympathy with distress, the same revolt against injustice, have been at work in France during the last forty years. The present volume contains a record of some of the results, and they are sufficiently remarkable. But every experiment made, whether it has proved a success or a failure, has its value either for encouragement or for warning. The following pages furnish sketches of failures only, but those are of a stupendous kind. The reader will see how men of unquestionable benevolence, of high ability, and of intrepid courage, may devote themselves to the task of regenerating society, and may find as the consequences of their efforts nothing but disorder and disappointment.

Shall we, then, sit down in despondency, and say that nothing can be done? Shall we, from the ill success of others, furnish excuses for apathy and sloth on our own part? Such is not the lesson we ought to learn from the recapitulation of the mistakes of our French neighbours. Though St. Simon, and Fourier, and Louis Blanc, have broken down in their erratic enterprises, that is no reason for despairing of the social advancement of our country.

I have met with men who have so far exaggerated, and abused, the doctrines of Adam Smith and of Malthus, as to find in what they call Political Economy, an excuse for selfishness and parsimony. If you ask these persons to assist in the support of a country clothing-club, they will tell you that such institutions are futile; because, by bettering artificially the condition of the poor, you encourage an undue increase of numbers. If you solicit their contributions to the funds of a provident-society, they answer you that they themselves never asked aid from any one, and that it is each man's duty to provide, by his own independent exertions, for the support of himself and his family.

Such unsocial sentiments as these, have made the name of Political Economy stink in the nostrils of men. These selfish doctrines, generally carried out by the upper and middle classes, would ruin, and would justly ruin, the most prosperous country. It is not by such individualism as this, it is not by the isolation of each family from its neighbours, that true prosperity, or even true independence, is to be attained. On the contrary: if we are to continue in the enjoyment of domestic order and of national greatness; if the lower classes are to live without envy, and the richer classes without fear;

it is to the cordial coöperation of all that such a consummation must be owing.

I will say nothing here of the prospect of improved organization of labour. My own prepossessions, perhaps my prejudices, are in favour of the present arrangements of employer and labourer. I look forward far more hopefully to education, to sanatory measures, to improvements in the administration of justice, than I do to coöperative societies, as the means of regenerating mankind. But it is quite unsafe to infer that, because such coöperative schemes have generally failed, therefore they will never succeed. Louis Blanc in his recent account of 1848 (written in admirable English), tells us that many associations formed in that year of revolution, are still prosperous. Experience may teach us hereafter, that there are some simple, or peculiar, branches of trade, which workmen may successfully combine to carry on without the aid of capitalists or employers.

POSTSCRIPT.

AT the time this little work was written, and indeed, until it was actually in print, I had not seen Louis Blanc's History of the Revolution of 1848. I was therefore, not aware of certain important facts, affecting the proceedings of some members of the Provisional Government. It appears :—

1. That Albert, who was commonly described as *ouvrier*, was really a mechanic, notwithstanding the repeated assertions to the contrary by the journals.

2. That the Luxembourg Commission, presided over by Louis Blanc, has been unjustly made responsible for the employment of the populace in the public works, called the *ateliers nationaux*. M. Louis Blanc states that these were set on foot, not merely without his concurrence, but notwithstanding his violent opposition. He holds himself and Albert responsible only for the coöperative workshops (at Clichy and else-

where) in which the labourers were to be entitled to a share of the profits.

3. I am glad to find also, that M. Louis Blanc denounces with wholesome vehemence the anarchical doctrines of Proudhon.

I may also mention, that on reading the proofs of my account of Emile de Girardin's work, I was so struck with the monstrosity of the opinions propounded, that I thought it necessary to consult a good authority on the subject. I am assured however, by a most intelligent Frenchman, that as far as can be judged, M. de Girardin was in earnest when he published his work, and was not imitating the irony of Burke in his *Vindication of Natural Society*.

CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.—INTRODUCTION.

	PAGE
French general notions—The word “exploiter”—English erroneous notions that lead to Socialism—Preachers—Adam Smith—Sketch of ancient political romances—Plato—More—Bacon—Harrington—The French recent authors	1

CHAP. II.—SAINT SIMON.

SECTION I.—Sketch of St. Simon's life—Noble birth—Early ambition—Revolution of 1789—Financial speculations—Travels—Madame de Staël—Marriage—Experiment on social life—Poverty—Publications—The Restoration—Satire on the Government—Works on social reorganization—Destitution and attempted suicide—The New Christianity—Few disciples—Death	21
SECTION II.—The New Christianity—The Pope and Luther condemned—Maxims, how propagated—Ill success—The disciples—Lectures—History divided into critical and organic periods—Capacity and labour to be rewarded—Inheritance to be abolished—Reasons against this	32
SECTION III.—Organization—Not democratic—An aristocracy, but not of birth—The so-called religion—Division of society into three grades—Government—Punishment of criminals—Position of women—Misrepresentation in Chamber of Deputies, in 1830—Titles of publications	56
SECTION IV.—The joint Pontiffs—Their character—Political revolution of 1830—Publication of St. Simonianism—The <i>Globe</i> journal becomes its organ—Rapid success in Paris and	

	PAGE
in the departments—The <i>Globe</i> , how conducted—Poetry, eloquence, philosophy—Ambition of M. Enfantin—Retirement and death of M. Bazard	78
SECTION V.—Change of management—Occasion of schism—Enfranchisement of prolétaires and of women—A female Messiah invoked—Series of fêtes—Treasury exhausted—Appeal to money—Loan—Secession of M. Rodrigues—Retirement of sect to Ménilmontant—Parti-coloured life—Strange exposition—A philosophical epic—Criminal proceedings against the sect—Dispersion	92
SECTION VI.—Louis Blanc's opinion of St Simonianism—Unequalled audacity—This denied as to religion, property, marriage—Objection that the State is made to swallow up the individual—The State the sole proprietor—These objections well founded	113

CHAP. III.—FOURIER.

SECTION I.—Fourier's birth, vocation, character—First publication, 1808—Obscure style—Desire of a patron—Comparison of public and private patronage—Second publication— <i>Pasionate attraction</i> —Explained—Other works—Samples of his mode, cosmogony, and psychology	121
SECTION II.—Proposed social system—Evils of present civilization—War, police, unproductive labourers—Proposed communism—Modified, not absolute—Amazing results as to happiness—Union of the whole world, with Constantinople as the capital—Industrial armies to subdue the deserts—Trebled longevity	143
SECTION III.—Details of the plan—A proposed commune or phalange—A square league of ground—1,800 persons—Habitation in common—Explanation of words phalange, phalanstère, série—Alleged pecuniary profit—Particular arrangements—Motives to labour—Three new passions discovered—Insufficiency to secure regular labour—Partial remedy in devotedness—Change of occupation every two hours—Remuneration of capital, labour, and talent—Frugality of phalanstère—But what obtained?—Absence of domestic servants absurd in practice—Actual evil of men-servants—Nursery proposed—Sexual relations—Instruction voluntary—Opera as amusement	161

	PAGE
SECTION IV.—Difficulties as to money, and as to getting the better class of inmates—Wealth doubled—Interest to capitalists at eight per cent—Reduced plan of simple harmony—Algeria a proper field—The Government neglected—Disciples, proceedings, and newspaper—Actual experiment—Failure—Fourier's death—His person—Efforts since—Estimate of Fourier	194

CHAP. IV.—LOUIS BLANC.

SECTION I.—Louis Blanc's <i>Organization of labour</i> —Begins with a child frozen to death—A change necessary—Louis Blanc not an epicurean or an ascetic—But hopes cessation of struggle—Formula of progress—Denunciation of the rich—Of England—Antagonism of capital and labour—Louis Blanc's theory of English policy—To conquer by commerce, by <i>laissez-faire</i> —English rapacity and unscrupulousness, but greatness and high political virtue—More examples of Louis Blanc's thoughts—Professed moderation—Education, if imperfect, injurious	210
---	-----

SECTION II.—Particular argument—Every man entitled to employment—Competition condemned—Must cause a constant fall of wages—I deny this—Facts in England—In France—Troyes—Matters generally grow worse—Audacious crime—An example of misery and murder—But low wages (I say) are not the principal cause of crime—Louis Blanc condemns individualism, and savings' banks, as leading to servility and avarice—French dread of a poor-law—Effect of competition on middle classes—Law of conspiracy—Illustration—I say, exceptional—Louis Blanc condemns morcellement of land	229
---	-----

SECTION III.—The proposed remedy—Brevity of Louis Blanc's explanation—National workshops to be originated by Government—The folly of the notion—Effect on middle classes—Louis Blanc's apology—A union of towns as well as of trades—Central corporation of each trade—Union of different trades—Illustration by Post-office—Provision for the destitute—A poor-law really wanted—The question of machinery	255
---	-----

	PAGE
SECTION IV.—Substitute for the former plan—Division of profit among workmen—Example of this in Paris in 1843—Cases in which this might be advantageous—reasons why it would not generally answer	271
SECTION V.—Recapitulation—How the work was received in Paris—Many objections raised by the periodical press—Louis Blanc's answers—How could Government find markets?—Comparison of Paraguay under the Jesuits—If competition ruinous, how are the United States prosperous?—Louis Blanc's plan is not one of association, but one of competition, viz., between capitalists and labourers—How fix rate of interest?—Difficulties about elections—Many other objections—Individualism the real point of attack	279
SECTION VI.—Louis Blanc on copyright—Would abolish—Why?—Because it destroys authority and corrupts authors—But does pay hinder other professional men from doing their duty?—Love of fame may also corrupt—Examples of English authors: Macaulay, Dickens, Scott, Byron, Gibbon, Hume, Goldsmith, Johnson—First principle of justice—M. Montei	291

CHAP. V.—PROUDHON.

SECTION I.—Proudhon's importance—A native and exhibitor of Besançon—His letter of 1840 to the Besançon Academy—Profession of doctrines of equality and of misanthropy—The Academy disavows him—M. Blanqui's letter—Proudhon's conclusion	307
SECTION II.—Social miseries and moral philosophy—Definition of property—but limits in practice—Definition of it in 1793, and of the Code Napoléon—Toullier on rights—The English avoid definitions—Why taxes should be levied in proportion to property—Proudhon condemns a poor-law—But all property now is held in fee and of the Crown, and therefore subject to the performance of duties—Property is robbery—Where?—Suppose Proudhon in Cayenne—Property is impossible—Arithmetic governs the world—Impossibility of property demonstrated—Proudhon a professed anarchist—Concluding rant	320

CHAP. VI.—THE FRENCH REVOLUTION OF 1848.

	PAGE
SECTION I.—Louis Blanc in power—How it happened—Commission of labour at the Luxembourg—First Proclamation—Hours of labour—Task-work—Abolition of middle-men—Sempstresses' petition against gaol-labour competition—My opinion—The <i>Maison Leclaire</i> system—Adopted by the <i>Presse</i> , &c.—Imperfect obedience of masters	343
SECTION II.—Direct employment of labourers by the Provisional Government—National workshops opened—What they were at first—Make-believe labour out of doors—Shoemaking and tailoring—Rate of wages paid—Proceedings at Havre—Labourers unreasonable—Number employed in Paris	358
SECTION III.—Poverty of Provisional Government—Rise of prices—Public declamation against capital—Lamartine's protest—Increasing demands and discontent—Danger that the workmen should lend themselves to the Red Republicans—Increasing ill-feeling between the lower and middle classes—Cavaignac and his troops—The crisis—Real destitution—Barricades—The fatal four days—End of the national workshops	366
SECTION IV.—Louis Blanc's language as an official person—Document issued by the Commission—Facts alleged—Reconciliation of masters and workmen—Reduced hours of labour—Bakers' strike—Pavloirs' strike—that of the drivers—that of the tilers subdued by appeal to patriotism—Various other cases—Established associations—that of tailors at Clichy—of saddlers—of spinners—Conclusion	379

CHAP. VII.—EMILE DE GIRARDIN.

LA POLITIQUE UNIVERSELLE

Décrets de l'avenir.

SECTION I.—History of the book—Irrreligious ideas—General notion of contents	390
--	-----

UNIVERSAL INSURANCE.

SECTION II.—Universal insurance the same thing with universal policy—My objection that the two things are not the same—National insurance impossible—Self-interest the foundation of morality—Right and wrong, a calculation of risks—Quotation from Bias	395
---	-----

UNIVERSAL PACIFICATION.

	PAGE
SECTION III.—War should be insured against—This scheme is really one of defensive alliance—Not a scheme of insurance at all	402

UNIVERSAL INSCRIPTION.

SECTION IV.—Old ideas in new words—Example of verbiage—The scheme is that every one should be registered in his parish each year—Not only age but state of private accounts and of the national accounts would give a certainty to statistics—The method a very expensive one—Infringement of individual liberty	404
--	-----

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE

SECTION V.—Minorities ought to be represented—Is M. de Girardin the author of this maxim?—Lord John Russell's application—M. de Girardin's plan—A state-mayor and a commission of control—Revolution said to be impossible—The state-mayor re-eligible—Comparison with President of United States—The state-mayor's extensive functions—No division of powers—No self-government—Wages to be regulated by the Government	411
--	-----

UNIVERSAL JUSTICE.

SECTION VI.—Courts are no longer to inflict any punishment, because justice is fallible—Practice tried by examples	423
--	-----

UNIVERSAL DOWRY.

Liberty in marriage, by equality of children with respect to their mother.

SECTION VII.—Statistics of illegitimacy—Said to be increasing—Is this true?—All children to be equal as regards their mother, and to belong altogether to their mother—Marriage is no longer to be sanctioned by the State—Every woman is to demand a dowry before cohabitation—Money difficulty—Objections met	428
---	-----

THE UNIVERSAL TENTH

SECTION VIII.—A State provision for the aged and destitute by a tax on employers—Regulation of workmen's labour—The scheme examined financially—A very bad poor-law	438
SECTION IX.—M. de Girardin's recapitulation—My conclusion	443

CHAP. VIII.—CONCLUSION.

	PAGE
Recapitulation of the leading doctrines—Exploitation condemned —My defence of capitalists—Two examples, first, Belgium during the famine; second, English manufacturers during slackness of trade—Competition—Acknowledged evils—Yet a necessary stimulus—The evils may be slowly corrected— By Education—By improved public opinion—Present want of moderation in pursuit of wealth—Varying desirability of property—Bodily labour not in itself an evil—Condition of the poor has really improved—The Rochdale co-operatives .	448

SOCIAL INNOVATORS,

AND

THEIR SCHEMES.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION.

French general notions—The word “exploiter”—English erroneous notions that lead to Socialism—Preachers—Adam Smith—Sketch of ancient political romances—Plato—More—Bacon—Harrington—The French recent authors.

I WAS lately conversing with an intelligent Frenchman, about theories of social organization. My companion, after quoting the opinion of the late Léon Faucher, to the effect that he and most other thinkers were to some extent infected with socialist doctrines, avowed that this statement was true of himself. “For,” said he, “I feel that as everything we possess and everything we enjoy, are the result of labour, it cannot be right for you and me, who are not producers, to share the results of labour.” I offered the very obvious reply, that a capitalist is as much a producer as a labourer; and I hazarded a simple illustration. Two

brothers who worked for me, both in the same employment, were equally skilful, equally vigorous, equally industrious, and therefore earned the same wages. But though both of them were men of sober and temperate habits, the one took the greater pleasure in spending his money, the other in saving it: the one married early, had a well-furnished house, smart clothes, and regular meals; the other remained many years a bachelor, dressed ever in fustian, and pinched his appetite. The thrifty brother, before he had reached middle life, had saved a few hundred pounds, with which he entered into business on his own account. "Now, tell me," I said, "is not this man, after his long-continued frugality, as well entitled to the income resulting from his self-denial, as the other brother to the wages earned by his daily toil?" My friend was candid enough to confess that he had no answer at hand, but he suggested that my greater familiarity with the subject was perhaps the cause of my apparent victory.

This sentiment, of the supreme rights of the labourer, to the exclusion of the rights of the capitalist, is at the bottom of all socialistic doctrines and projects. The language applied to employers of labour points them out as selfish, indifferent to the claims of the working classes, intent on promoting their own interests without any consideration for those below them. The French theorists use with respect to capitalists the verb *exploiter*, for which I know no exact equivalent in our tongue; but by which is conveyed the notion that an employer regards his workmen just as he regards his

horses and cows, or his mine, or the goodwill of his business: merely as things from which a profit is to be derived.

It is true, no doubt, that the farmer and the manufacturer carry on their respective businesses with a view mainly to their own advantage, and not with the intention of benefiting their labourers. Among ourselves, if a capitalist pays his people the full current rate of wages, if he consults their convenience as to hours and manner of work, if he studies their well-being by discouraging intemperance and immorality among them, and acknowledges that they have the first claim to any charity he may exercise, he is held to perform the duties of his position. But the socialists arrive at a very different conclusion. Real kindness, accompanied with amenity of manner, is in their eyes a mere palliative, which leaves the original evil uncorrected; perhaps even an hypocritical manoeuvre by which the master is desirous of concealing his abominable usurpation on the rights of his fellow-creatures. The manufacturer and the farmer are, after all, ogres who grind the bones of their victims to make their bread.

It is obvious that the tendency of such invectives is most deplorable. At all times there is a disposition on the part of the lowest classes to a grudging jealousy towards the more opulent; towards those who live without hand-labour, who have abundance of food to eat, and fine clothes to wear, and whose struggles, anxieties, and despondencies, are hidden from the public. At particular periods there needs but a Wat Tyler

to nurse these dispositions till they break out into open violence and spoliation. Those who thoroughly understand the true interests of the poor, and are sincerely desirous of promoting them, will seek to extinguish and not to fan the smouldering fire of discontent. But the French socialists, some of them in ignorance, and some probably, in wanton perversity, encourage and aggravate the dissatisfaction that exists.

I am sorry to have to add that even in this country, and in the most unexpected quarters, there are random observations and exhortations addressed to popular audiences, tending in the same unhappy direction. I lately heard from an Irish clergyman of the Establishment, a sermon in favour of the reformation movement. I had no fault to find with the general tone of the address, which was carefully prepared and lucid, and set off with more liveliness than is generally found in the discourses of the worthy incumbents on this side the channel. But one portion seemed to me redolent of socialism, though without the remotest intention on the part of the preacher that it should be so.

“Is there not one law for the rich and another for the poor?” we were asked: “does not the law wink at the same offence in a well-dressed man, which it severely punishes in the ragged and tattered wretch? Does not society tolerate in the affluent what it harshly represses in the destitute?”

But is this really so? Do Englishmen concede to broadcloth a license which they refuse to frieze? A policeman puts into the dock at a petty sessions, a man

who was picked out of the gutter the night before, and who is charged as "drunk and incapable." If all the property found about him is a pocket-knife and a few coppers, he is dismissed with a reprimand; if he has a watch and a pocket-book he is fined five shillings. If the next prisoner is charged with embezzlement, let him be ever so well dressed, he will not find his smart appearance accepted as an answer to the charge. It is seldom that a prisoner has committed a theft from downright want; but when such a thing does happen, the sunken cheek and attenuated frame plead far more strongly in Court than fine linen and fortune. Less than a century ago indeed, in Ireland, perhaps in England, justice was not equally administered as it is now, and I can only suppose that our Irish clergyman was one of that large class of whom Edmund Burke speaks, as being always fifty years in arrears as to their opinions.

Then again, with regard to the offences which are dealt with by public opinion rather than by judicial proceedings: it surely is most untrue that a higher tone of morals is required from the labourer than from the master. I should be sorry to speak harshly of my uneducated countrymen; yet I cannot pretend that their habits are such as would be considered creditable in persons of my own class. A gentleman who gets drunk at a dinner-party will scarcely receive a second invitation from his host, but it would be useless to set a black mark against a farm labourer or a mechanic who lurches in his walk home from a club-feast. Few

workmen will voluntarily repay a sum borrowed from an employer, but what should we say of an employer who took advantage of the ignorance of a workman to pay him less than his due? I wish that all the clergy would reflect on these facts before lightly pointing a moral with false and obsolete comparisons.

About the same time I listened to another exhortation from a worthy clergyman, who was desirous of stirring us up to some work of philanthropy. I do not suspect him of being a disciple of the old school of rhetoric which taught its pupils not to be contented with the true, but to aim by whatever means at the convincing: as for instance, not to complain to a judge that a certain little man had stopped you on the highway, but to add, even falsely, that the robber had a companion. The preacher, I am persuaded, believed what he said, and was quite unconscious of the inaccuracy and evil tendency of his prelections.

He remarked that as he walked through the streets of the town his heart sank when he thought of the occupants of the houses on either side of him: of their coarse food, and rough clothing, and narrow houses, and above all, of their daily, monotonous, and unremitting toil. As he dilated on these topics, my astonishment and disgust grew upon me until I was ready to shout out a denial or leave the church. To say nothing of the Christian religion, which certainly assigns the palm of happiness to the poor; whose Founder and apostles, whose martyrs and confessors have not been commonly among the wealthy or the noble; mere philo-

sophy, mere observation of life, would have taught a more wholesome doctrine.

I am not contending for any ascetic principles: I am not about to assert that cold and hunger, fatigue and insufficient shelter are blessings. The pity of the preacher was directed to the coarseness of the food, not to any scantiness of quantity; to the roughness of the dress, not to any deficiency of clothing; to the smallness of the apartments, not to any exposure to cold; finally, to the necessity of daily toil, without any alleviation of such toil as would injure the frame. Now such pity seems to me the result of a superficial, childish view of the world; and indicates a mind which is so far epicurean, and so far indolent, as to regard (most falsely to regard) ease and exemption from bodily labour as necessary to happiness. Health of body and of mind are regarded by all true philosophy as the conditions of felicity; but these are obtained not by ease, not by indulgence, but by active occupation. Coarse but sufficient food a cause of unhappiness! regular bodily toil a matter of pity! How much more would the middle classes enjoy life, how much freer would they be from dyspepsia and its black train of heavy thoughts, if necessity limited their meals! How much more vigorous and lively their enjoyments, if daily labour prepared them for rest, and bodily exertion preceded their feasts!

I may be met no doubt, with the inquiry: if you think the working classes as happy as you are, why do you not become yourself a mechanic? The answer is obvious: I cannot if I would; my body and my mind have

both been trained to a different course of life. All I contend for is, that if it had been my lot to be born in a cottage, to be apprenticed to a blacksmith, and to reach manhood with a body invigorated by hard labour, and a brain undisturbed by anxieties and subtle speculations, I might have enjoyed as fair a chance of happiness as in that middle class of society in which my fortune has been cast.

After all, why need I insist upon this point? What more fertile theme has in all ages offered itself to moralists, than the compensations which render one position in the world nearly as desirable as another? Not many years ago I saw a notice of a volume written by a Frenchman, who undertook to prove elaborately, that an accession of fortune added to a man's happiness during three months and no longer. I should be sorry if our preachers and moralists should generally adopt the very different tone of which I am now complaining, and should make it their business to ferment the discontent which naturally flows from the unsatisfied and ill-regulated passions of all classes. Let them remember the sentiment put into the mouth of Henry V:—

“No, not all these, thrice-gorgeous ceremony,
 Not all these, laid in bed majestical,
 Can sleep so soundly as the wretched slave;
 Who with a body filled and vacant mind,
 Gets him to rest, crammed with distasteful bread,
 Never sees horrid night, the child of hell;
 But like a lackey, from the rise to set,
 Sweats in the eye of Phoebus, and all night
 Sleeps in Elysium * * *
 And but for ceremony, such a wretch,
 Winding up days with toil, and nights with sleep,
 Had the forehand and vantage of a king.”

But I have observed that even grave, thoughtful, scientific writers, fall occasionally into a train of ideas, equally false, and equally tending to the support of socialistic dogmas. Take Adam Smith, for example, the great master of political economy. In Book i., cap 8, we find :

“In that original state of things which precedes both the appropriation of land and the accumulation of stock, the whole produce of labour belongs to the labourer. He has neither landlord nor master to share it with him.

“Had this state continued, the wages of labour would have augmented with all those improvements in its productive powers to which the division of labour gives occasion.”

If Adam Smith's deliberate opinion is to be gathered from this passage, he believed that there is a state of society in which all the commodities produced by the labourer belong to himself; and that as the land comes to be appropriated, and stock comes to be accumulated, the labourer is by these changes deprived of a part of that which would have belonged to him. Passing over the appropriation of land, let us look fairly in the face, the statement that the accumulation of stock robs the labourer of part of his natural reward.

I always find myself best able to conceive the applicability of economical doctrines, by migrating in imagination to the outskirts of civilization, where the white man trained in advanced communities to habits of order and industry, has voluntarily committed himself to a contest with the wilderness. Let us then picture

to ourselves a Canadian settler who has had a free grant of forest, and who isolates himself from the world. Here is no landlord to oppress him, no capitalist to filch the fruits of his toil.

Let us suppose that at first, from idleness, or ignorance, he neglects to clear his land, but trusts to his skill in shooting and fishing, and is contented to lodge in a hollow tree. Getting tired of this unsophisticated life, however, he contrives by increased industry and self-denial, to clear a patch of the forest and to sow some seed he has had given him. The harvest season comes round, and he reaps his little crop and stores it up in a granary he has constructed. From this time his course is comparatively an easy one, because he is no longer dependent on the precarious produce of the chase, but has his year's maintenance provided. Is this change for the better or the worse? For the better, no doubt. And yet that happy period of which Adam Smith has chaunted the praises, has passed away. While the settler relied on his hunting and fishing, there was no accumulation of stock or none worth mentioning; there was no appropriation of land. But now a stock of subsistence has been accumulated, and land has by cultivation been appropriated.

But it may be said that this exile has neither landlord to oppress him nor capitalist to harm him. The answer is obvious: he is his own landlord and his own banker: the landlord, the capitalist, the labourer, are united in the same person. Then again it may be said that the ordinary labourer of civilized society is in such a position

that he cannot be like this emigrant; that he is generally tied to the place of his birth, and so cannot slip away from the yoke of landlord and capitalist. But this grievance, if it be one, is quite different from the one alleged by Adam Smith. His complaint is that a certain period has passed away: that in the new period which has succeeded the labourer has come to be only a labourer. I think it might be shown, if space permitted, that on the principle of the division of labours, this change is actually for the advantage of the labourer. At any rate it appears to me indisputable that the labourer has nothing to regret in that period when land was not appropriated and stock was not accumulated; unless we adopt the wild notion of Rousseau, and contend that a savage state is preferable to that of civilized society.

It would be easy to show that the other sentence I have quoted is equally incorrect. "The wages of labour would have augmented with all those improvements in its productive powers to which the division of labour gives occasion." This is on the hypothesis that there had taken place neither any appropriation of land nor any accumulation of stock. But in what quarter of the world, under what organization of society, have the productive powers of labour increased, without an accumulation of stock? Is it among the Red Indians who live on the produce of their hunting? Is it again among the nomade tribes where even a considerable accumulation has taken place? If there be any verity in social science, these doctrines may be taken as

proved by the undisputed testimony of experience: that labour cannot be productive until men have sat down upon portions of land, and by cultivating have appropriated it; and that in the absence of an accumulation of stock no considerable division of labour can possibly take place.

I know what a French socialist may here object. He may say, in the past experience of mankind it is true that appropriation of land to individuals, and accumulation of stock by individuals, have been necessary to progress; but that under the organization he recommends that necessity ceases. He may go on to claim Adam Smith as an authority for his doctrine. But this is the very thing I am now complaining of. I know that Adam Smith was in the general tenor of his opinions utterly opposed to such action of the government, and to such combination among individuals as would hinder the freest possible competition: that he was entirely at issue with those general notions which lead to socialism and communism. I regret, therefore, that he should have carelessly dropped expressions utterly at variance with his usual theories.

I will now point out very briefly how it is, as I conceive, that the most remarkable of the social panaceas have come into the world.

The opinions which men entertain must, of necessity, be considerably influenced by the circumstances of their lives; and this is especially true of their political tenets. A theorist of Milan or Pisa, in the days of Italian freedom, could not possibly hold the same opinions or experience

the same desires with an Englishman of the present day. If we can conceive Liverpool and Manchester to become independent governments, like the Italian cities of the middle ages; if we can realise to our own minds the results which would follow, should the mutual jealousy of those two cities cease to be repressed by the central authority of the kingdom; if we can imagine the one training her dock labourers and the other arming her mechanics, for constant aggression and defence; we may then have a faint notion of the history and the passions of the celebrated Italian republics.

But the state of ancient Greece was not very unlike this. It is not without an effort that we believe how small was that celebrated country. We are fond of contrasting the littleness of Great Britain, with its supremacy in the world: but what is that contrast when we satisfy ourselves by a renewed glance at the map, that all the renowned states of Greece were contained within little more than a couple of degrees of latitude and as many of longitude! Within this mere arena were carried on all the struggles of Athens and Lacedemon for predominance; all the fights by sea and land against the king and his barbarian hosts; all the forensic contests and treacheries and recriminations, and all the battles lost or won, which ended in slavery to the Macedonian. A country so small and so subdivided, was the scene of perpetual contest. It was necessary therefore, not merely for the acquisition of power and of fame, but even for the security of exist-

ence, that each little state should be constantly prepared for war; and that every citizen of military age should be ready to take the field when danger arose. This is the leading idea of Plato when he develops his social theories in *the Republic* and *the Laws* and in his unfinished political romance. But Plato had witnessed the turbulence, the inconstancy, the gullibility, of the popular assembly of Athens; and I should be far from joining with those who accuse him of treachery to the constitution of his country, because he gave a preference to the government, not indeed of a few rich, but of a few men of the highest ability, over the government of the incompetent many.

Sir Thomas More's Utopia, again, resulted from the circumstances which surrounded its author. Sir Thomas was troubled with a tender heart, which was pained by the distressful condition in which he saw crowds of his countrymen, driven by want of work to beggary, and by the insufficiency of alms impelled to crime. It has not generally been noticed that at the commencement of Henry VIII.'s reign, while this country was still Roman Catholic, there was a vast amount of unemployed poor and unrelieved destitution. But the early portion of the Utopia is a sufficient proof of the fact; and it is the more remarkable because at a period not very long before this, there had been a statute limiting the rate of wages and thus proving a deficiency of hands. We are told too by Adam Smith and by others who follow him, that the suppression of the monasteries was the cause of that misery which led

to the enactment of the 43rd of Elizabeth. It seems however, that before Henry's conscience towards his wife had been disturbed by Anne's beauty, and years before the monasteries had trembled at a whisper of spoliation, the hungry crowd of mendicants harassed the compassionate soul of More. From this kindly sympathy sprang the Utopia.

But More, as it seems to me, was not a bold or an original thinker. His proposed polity with its city and surrounding country dependent on it, its strict communism and banishment of all individual property, its republican spirit and its minute regulations, all savour strongly of his master, Plato. We regard More as a martyr of the Church of Rome; yet his model city has nothing of the Roman Catholic, nothing even of the Christian about it. If it be objected that the work was the mere amusement of its author, I reply that I cannot think so, when I remember its earnest sympathy with the destitute, its severe denunciation of the selfish landowners and oppressors of the weak, its zealous recommendation of gentle measures with offenders, in place of those savage stocks and whippings and brandings, and hangings by thousands, which disgraced the Tudor reigns. But philanthropic as were More's intentions, I fear that his communism and his vexatious regulations, would have constituted a remedy worse than the evil to be corrected.

Bacon's *New Atlantis* is commonly classed with the philosophical romances I have mentioned; but it has really nothing in common with them, and reminds one

more of Abraham Cowley's proposed scheme "for the advancement of experimental philosophy," than of Plato's City and More's Utopia. Bacon, no doubt, announced his intention of giving a model of political government, in addition to that of a college of natural philosophy which he has left us under the title of Solomon's House. But his heart was so bent on the immediately useful, his distaste to the cultivation of the science of mind is so distinctly shown in his denunciation of the divine philosophy of Plato, that I cannot think the world would have gained much from any Baconian treatise on moral philosophy, or from any model polity founded on such philosophy.

The only other work I need mention is that of Harrington. People of even excellent education, though familiar with the name of the *Oceana*, are ignorant of its contents. In truth, though the book is curious and worthy of study, there is that in its long-winded style, its barbarous nomenclature, and its elaborate subdivisions, which makes it repulsive to most readers.

Harrington, like other romancers, was impelled by the circumstances around him, acting on his peculiar temperament. In no mind of that day does there seem to have been a more bitter and sustained conflict between the two hostile political principles. A man of knightly birth, a high-minded gentleman, he joined the ranks of Hampden and the Parliament: appointed by his party to watch over the captive king, Charles's dignified melancholy and graceful resignation so won upon the guardian as to make him suspected by his

own party: after attending the victim on the scaffold and receiving his latest courtesies, the recollection of that mournful scene haunted him until, as is believed, it drove him to distraction: in the retirement to which he had betaken himself, he applied his mind to study and meditation, and produced his celebrated *Occana*.

Harrington however, did not, like the chivalrous Falkland, become a convert to the cause of royalty; he did not like Clarendon become an apologist for the Stuarts and utter invectives against the parliamentary leaders. While he indulged a melancholy grief for Charles, he held fast to his republican opinions. But his model state is not borrowed from Plato; it has nothing of the enforced communism of the Utopia; for it was not in such a polity that he saw a cure for the evils which afflicted England: and it was not on an idle philosophy but on the real establishment of good government that his mind was bent. Venice and not Athens, an aristocracy and not a democratic republic, was the model after which Harrington worked. The possessors of land were to be the governors of the State, and their election to the necessary offices was to be made by the Venetian system of drawing lots and not by an appeal to the inconstant multitude.

The fate of the author was distressing. First he was driven into melancholy by the execution of a king whose person he loved and revered, while he condemned his office: then his book was seized by Cromwell whom he would willingly have seen the real protector of a regulated aristocracy: and from Charles II.

he experienced still less magnanimous treatment; being arrested by his orders and kept in confinement until his resentful spirit working with an empirical physician finally robbed him of all sanity. Such was the lot of the genius who composed the *Oceana*.

The modern socialistic doctrines of France, and the wild schemes grafted upon them, have had a close connection, like those of Plato and More and Harrington, with the circumstances of the people among whom they have been invented and have taken root. In England, at a period when we had scarcely escaped from the consequences attendant upon a long war, with its disturbance of the wages and means of living of the industrial classes, Robert Owen had some promise of success in the great towns, when he told the mechanics that by co-operation and communism they might be relieved of the alleged oppressions under which they were suffering. But a few years' experience put an end to that illusion. Not Owen's success as a manufacturer and as a philanthropist on a limited sphere, not his unwearied activity, not his repeated voyages, not his devotion of person and fortune to the cause, could accomplish anything solid or durable.

But if the state of England had been that which prevailed on the other side of the Channel, the result might have been different. The condition of the French labouring classes has during many ages been lamentably wretched. In earlier times, while our brave archers were the terror of Europe, *Jacques bonhomme* was the sport of every armed hand: and in reading the sombre

pages of Sismondi's long-drawn annals, nothing is more painful than the pictures of peasant destitution. In the reign of Louis XIV., the fiscal oppressions suffered by the industrious, excited the indignation of the great engineer Vauban; and that scientific, patriotic, and kind-hearted man, incurred the anger of the king for his plain-spoken remonstrances. Until the approach of the revolution of 1789 little improvement had taken place. The burden and the inequality of taxation, added to the thousand feudal rights still exacted, without any return of protection or assistance on the part of the absentee landlords, account for the *jacquerie* that disgraced the country; and afterwards supplied the hordes of soldiers who with nothing to lose and everything to hope for, devoted themselves to carrying out the will of the convention.

In our time, though the old oppressions are removed there is still great destitution. In the country parts the splitting up of the land into eleven million separate estates, the greater part with a few shillings a year of rental, prevents all improvement, and makes any legal assistance to the poor impossible. In the great towns, the restlessness and marvellous immorality of the people, make them greedy of every novelty. Thus it is that oppression formerly and destitution in the present day, have led to the ready reception in France of schemes however monstrous or hopeless. Fourier and St. Simon and Louis Blanc and Proudhon have found willing disciples for projects which a contented population would have treated with neglect.

In the following pages will be found a sketch of some of the more noted of these schemes : of the New Christianity of St. Simon, of the phalansteres of Fourier, of the socialism of Louis Blanc, of the levelling doctrines of Proudhon. Of these authors I think it will be found that Fourier is the most extravagant, Louis Blanc is the most eloquent, St. Simon is the most scholarly, and Proudhon is the most scholastic. Fourier raves, Louis Blanc declaims, St. Simon lectures, and Proudhon wrangles.

CHAPTER II.

SAINT SIMON.

SECTION I. — Sketch of St. Simon's life—Noble birth—Early ambition—Revolution of 1789—Financial speculations—Travels—Madame de Stael—Marriage—Experiments on social life—Poverty—Publications—The Restoration—Satire on the Government—Works on social reorganization—Destitution and attempted suicide—The New Christianity—Few disciples—Death.

THE name of St. Simon is well known in England; yet few persons I believe, are familiar either with his life, or with the doctrines he propounded. He is thought of as an enthusiast or an impostor, who succeeded for a time in propagating certain socialistic or communistic doctrines, among our excitable Parisian neighbours. That the sect he founded did really rush into wild extravagances, may be judged from the fact that Louis Blanc, no tame supporter of existing institutions, characterized St. Simonism as "the most audacious of modern inventions." The founder of the sect, however, was no vulgar impostor, but a man of noble birth, an officer of the army under the old régime, a diligent student, and a persevering thinker.

Henri de St. Simon was of a family that affected to trace its descent from Charlemagne, and which was certainly one of the noblest houses of France. Henri

was entitled by his birth to take rank as an officer before the Revolution of 1789, and he served in America with Lafayette against the English. This commencement of his career was well fitted to develop the original and whimsical genius of the man; and his experience of the enthusiasm and the horrors of the French Revolution, of the eloquence of Mirabeau, of the execution of the king, of hopes disappointed and massacres perpetrated, of military despotism and unheard-of conquests, may explain, if it does not justify, a recklessness of character that made experiments on immorality, and treated society as a play-thing.

“Rise, Monsieur le Comte, you have great things to do.” Such, at seventeen years old, was the morning soliloquy of St. Simon, as his disciples were fond of relating. He belonged to a large class whose aim is beyond their powers or their opportunities; who, if born to labour with their hands, are discontented till they rise to be masters, though devoid perhaps of talent or prudence; who, if blessed with a competence and education, strive to attain to literary eminence, though wanting in invention or reasoning powers; who, if nursed among the luxuries of the aristocracy, account nothing gained unless they can arrive at honours for which they are nowise fitted but by inordinate ambition. From his youth till his death in 1825, St. Simon despised the present and lived on impracticable dreams of future achievements.

Some men no doubt, endued by nature with great

powers, are slow in exerting them; and for want of the sharp spur of ambition, dream away the best part of their lives, and sink into the grave without honour. St. Simon however, early began to seek the distinction he anticipated. At nineteen years old, he laid before the Mexican authorities, a scheme for a canal across the Isthmus of Panama; and at twenty-five, he proposed to the Spanish Government a similar plan for uniting Madrid to the coast. The idea had occurred to him, of applying the services of the army to the formation of such works.

When the revolution of 1789 broke out, instead of taking a part in it, as we might have anticipated, he entered on some financial speculations, in partnership with a Prussian. He was not particularly successful, and in 1797 he abandoned this pursuit, taking out a capital of less than 6,000*l*. His disciples, jealous of his honour, point to his declaration, that he did not become a speculator with the sordid desire of amassing a fortune; but that he regarded the possession of money as necessary to carry out his intention, "of founding a great scientific school, and a great industrial establishment." The rest of his career exonerates him from all imputation of avarice. But looking at the reckless way in which he afterwards played with the dearest interests of society, I should say of his stock-broking, that this, if not the most dignified, was perhaps one of the most innocent portions of his life.

St. Simon now turned his attention to science, with a view to fit himself for his proposed task of founding a

sect. He did not however, condescend to become a pupil like an ordinary mortal, but established himself close to the Polytechnic School, and invited astronomers and other savans to his table, dropping among them a few pieces of gold, which seldom found their way back to his pocket. Having picked up as many notions as satisfied him, he migrated to the neighbourhood of the Medical School, where he repeated the same process. If, as is probable, he used his scientific friends as guides to study, and as a means of smoothing occasional difficulties, he may have derived great advantage from his intercourse with them.

He had previously visited North America and Spain: he now renewed his travels; running over England and Germany. Among us, he learnt nothing of any importance for his purpose: and indeed, the reaction in England that was caused by the revolution of 1789, the disposition to hold fast by existing institutions, and by the old fashioned Christian religion, must have excited contempt on the part of the French innovator. But among the Germans he must have felt far more at home, as they were in a state of fermentation with their mystic philosophy; and many hints may have been treasured up to reappear in the deathbed revelation. It was on this journey that he visited Madame de Staël at Coppet, where he behaved to that celebrated lady in a way which, in England, would have cost him a horsewhipping. Scarcely had he been introduced into the presence of the Baroness, when he said, "Madame, you are the most extraordinary woman in the world;

I am the most extraordinary man: if we could become the parents of a child, it would no doubt be still more remarkable." Madame de Staël, says the French authority, had sense enough to take the remark in good part, and to laugh at it.

On his return to Paris St. Simon married. But he did not do this as an Englishman does it; from an attachment to his proposed wife, or from an expectation of domestic happiness: nor as a Frenchman does it; from a sense of suitability and a calculation of desirable consequences: he did it as a scientific experiment, as a means of educating himself for his great mission. Being a married man he could receive his friends; and he says that he desired to make use of his new position, as a means of studying learned men, a proceeding that he thought necessary for the execution of his enterprise. For to amend the organization of science, it is not sufficient to be well acquainted with the state of human knowledge: it is necessary also, to catch the results produced on the mind of students; to appreciate the influence of science on their passions, on their understanding, and on the whole, and each separate portion, of their moral being. This experiment proved to be the most costly of all. Balls, dinners, and soirées, prolific sources of experience, swallowed up the remainder of the 6,000*l.* gained by speculation. The project continued twelve months, during which the author of it, calm and observant, made trial of good and ill; of play, debauch, decent conversation, and lofty discussion; all by way of experiment. "If,"

says he, "I see a man, who has not embarked on a career of general science, frequenting places for gaming and debauchery, and not scrupulously avoiding the society of notorious immorality, I pronounce such an one to be on the road to ruin. . . . But if this man is pursuing theoretic philosophy; if his aim is to rectify the line of demarcation which separates good actions from bad; if he is bent on finding the means of healing those mental diseases which lead us astray from the true road of happiness; I say that this man traverses the road of vice in the way which will inevitably conduct him to the highest virtue."

St. Simon's small fortune had disappeared; henceforth he was destined to an experiment of a less agreeable kind: like another Timon of Athens, he was to seek from others the hospitality he had previously bestowed; like the same Timon it was his fate to endure poverty and privation: but unlike Timon, he had pursued the primrose path of dalliance with his eyes open, and bore his reverses with fortitude and cheerfulness. As if foreseeing his own destiny, he had, many years before, proposed a scheme for the maintenance of men of science and of genius, in his "Letters of an Inhabitant of Geneva to his Contemporaries." His proposition was, that a subscription should be opened before the tomb of Newton, and that every man should assist according to his own pleasure: that every subscriber should name three mathematicians, three natural philosophers, three chemists, three physiologists, three literary men, three painters, three musi-

cians: that the three of each vocation who obtained the greatest number of votes should receive an equal share of the subscription: and that this proceeding should be repeated annually. We should cry woe to men who presumed to depend on so precarious a maintenance; but the whimsical Timon judged otherwise. After elaborating his notion in a series of letters, "Rome," he adds, "will renounce the pretension of being the metropolis of my church; pope, cardinals, bishops, and priests, will cease to speak in my name." This rhapsody will not be intelligible to those unacquainted with St. Simon's future history; but it reveals the existence in his mind of the germ of those strange pretensions which afterwards expanded into his *New Christianity*.

Other publications now occupied St. Simon's attention. Napoleon had desired the *Institute* to furnish him an account of the progress of science from 1789; and to tell him what was its natural state, and what means could be adopted to advance it. St. Simon replied to this demand by his *Letters to the Bureau of Longitude*. But this work instead of being what it professed, was really an exhortation to scientific men, to enter on a labour of organization. "Since the fifteenth century," he said, "until the present time, the institution which united the European nations, which served as a bridle on the ambition of states and of kings, has been gradually decaying; it is now completely destroyed; and a general and frightful war, a war which threatens to devour all the people of Europe, has subsisted these

twenty years, and has cut off many millions of men. You alone can reorganize European society. Time presses: blood is flowing: quicken your determination.' To carry out this scheme, St. Simon proposed a sort of intellectual magistracy. We shall see that this imagined magistracy afterwards developed itself into a hierarchy of capacities, an essential part of the St. Simonian organization. It will easily be believed that the Institute paid little attention to this exhortation, and shrank from entering on the field of politics, while unbidden by its able and despotic dictator.

While this and other works were appearing in obscure adversity, the restoration took place. St. Simon at this time was maintaining himself as a subordinate clerk in the Mont-de-Piété. The speculator who had retired with 6,000*l.*, the scholar who had played the Mécœnas to students and professors, the private gentleman who had assembled wits and men of fashion around his table, was now reduced to subsist by monotonous labour, with a salary of 40*l.* a year. He would, no doubt, have shared in the liberalities of the king, who would not have overlooked the necessities of the representative of an historical name: but what could be done by a reactionary court, for a thinker so whimsical and outspoken? A few years later, in 1819, the disappointment showed itself in an audacious pamphlet, *the Parable*. After supposing that France was suddenly deprived of its fifty best natural philosophers, of its fifty best artists, of its fifty best poets, &c., altogether of three thousand of its most distinguished intellects;

St. Simon says it would require a generation to pass away, before such losses could be restored. "But what if it should lose in one day, Monsieur the king's brother, Monseigneur the Duke d'Angoulême, Monseigneur the Duke de Berry, Monseigneur the Duke d'Orléans, Monseigneur the Duke de Bourbon, Madame the Duchess d'Angoulême, Madame the Duchess de Berry, Madame the Duchess d'Orléans, Madame the Duchess de Bourbon, and Mademoiselle de Condé. Say it loses at the same time all the high officers of the Crown, all the ministers of State, all the masters of requests, all the marshals, all the cardinals, archbishops, bishops, grand-vicars and canons, all the prefects and sub-prefects, all the clerks in the state offices, all the judges, and to complete the list, the ten thousand richest of the princely proprietors.

"The misfortune would certainly distress the French, because they are kind hearted, because they could not witness without emotion the sudden disappearance of so great a number of their countrymen. But this loss of thirty thousand persons, reputed to be the most important to the State, would cause grief merely as a matter of feeling, for no damage would be caused to the State."

This clever and bitter satire, written by such a man, and mentioning a great number of the highest personages by name, did not improve the author's prospects of royal patronage. It caused so much indignation, that a criminal action was instituted, but resulted in an acquittal. Yet if St. Simon had no friend among persons of his own rank, he had one of humble birth,

a M. Diard. He had formerly employed this man, and was now indebted to him for the means of living. Diard insisted that his former patron should leave his humiliating employment at 40*l.* a year; he took him into his house, supplied him with maintenance, and even incurred the expense of printing some of his works. As long as Diard lived, St. Simon wanted nothing; but after Diard's death, as we shall see, he fell into extreme indigence. It should be added that *the Parable* was an ebullition of impatience and of wit, quite inconsistent with the rest of the author's career, and one which his future disciples were far from regarding as a matter of pride.

About this time were written several works of a character very different from the political pamphlet: *The Re-organization of European Society, Industry, The Organizer, Policy, The Industrial System, Catechism of Industrials, Opinions literary, philosophical, and industrial.* These had a slow sale, and it was only by pressing solicitation, and by submitting to many humiliations, that the author succeeded in placing them before the public. The notoriety of his attack on the established authorities would, no doubt, have made it easy for him to live by political journalism; and if he had followed Coleridge's example in writing for the *Morning Post*, we should not have thought him degraded by such labour. It is wonderful that he should not have preferred this life to that of begging from door to door, the assistance of a publisher. Into such indigence did he fall after the death of his humble

friend Diard, that, as he says himself, "During the last fortnight I have been living on bread and water: I have been at work without fire, and I have even sold my clothes to furnish the cost of publication. It is my passion for science and for the public weal, it is my desire of finding the means of gently putting an end to the alarming crisis in which all European societies are plunged, which have cast me into this state of distress. Therefore, without a blush, I can avow my indigence, and request the help necessary for continuing my labours."

St. Simon professed that he had foreseen these troubles, and that he generally bore them with equanimity. Once however, his fortitude gave way, and the apostle of a new creed attempted suicide. He fired a loaded pistol at his head, but the bullet failed to reach a vital part, and he recovered from his wound with the loss of an eye. His *New Christianity* was still to be thought out and to turn the heads of young disciples. This was the last of his works, revealed to new and ardent friends almost on his death-bed, and destined for some years to play an important part among the many whimsical pretensions of that time.

After all, St. Simon's disciples, when he died in 1825, were but few, though they afterwards swelled into a sect of sufficient numbers and zeal, to be thought formidable by the Government. The estimate they formed of their deceased master, may be found expressed at length in the *Doctrine de St. Simon*, published at Paris in 1831, while the sect was in full vigour. St. Simon is there

spoken of as a new Socrates, whose life of sacrifices, and even of humiliations, was crowned by an imperturbable calm in the presence of death. A Roman Catholic, to whom these remarks are addressed, had objected, that he could not believe in a man whose life had been sullied by notorious irregularities. The disciple replies, that his master's career had been a struggle after excellence, chequered by frequent lapses; but that after each fall he had risen higher than before, as the advancing tide rises higher after every recession. If it were true that he did constantly advance in moral excellence, it would indeed be inconsistent in any professing Christian, to throw his early sins in his teeth. The disciple adds that St. Simon, a martyr to daily inculpations, passionately attached to suffering humanity, penetrated the laws of history, as a means of leading our future destinies, and bequeathed his discoveries to the world, as a sublime inheritance.

SECTION II.—The New Christianity—The Pope and Luther condemned—Maxims, how propagated—Ill success—The disciples—Lectures—History divided into critical and organic periods—Capacity and labour to be rewarded—Inheritance to be abolished—Reasons against this.

The previous section contains a rapid sketch of the life of St. Simon. I propose now to explain what was the character of the *New Christianity* I have mentioned; what were the circumstances under which it came into the world; and what were the results on the minds of the men who adopted it.

We have seen that St. Simon's career had been unpropitious. It has been said that a man who desires the favour of the world, must advance half way to meet it. This prudence was not exhibited in the present case. Of the sixty-five years that St. Simon lived, from 1760 to 1825, the greater portion after his youth was passed, was, according to his friendly biographers, applied thus: in getting money for future purposes, seven years; in collecting scientific materials, seven years; in the renovation of philosophy, ten years; in the renovation of policy, ten years. After this came the conception of New Christianity.

The following view of this whimsical system, is taken by a French author; who, though no disciple, has written in a fair and almost friendly spirit. The leading ideas of the system are neither remarkable nor new; but are pretty much, those of all schismatics. They are these: that Christianity has lost its simplicity, and that all the churches are grossly corrupt: that a distinction must be maintained between divine revelation and human commentaries; between the text and the glosses upon it. Assuming these positions, it is argued, that Christianity is progressive in its nature, and ought not to be confined within the limits of the canonical books, but that it ought to act and be acted on by the events of each period, and ought to be modified according to the existing manners of each nation and age; and that the only part of it which ought to remain eternally unchanged, is the lesson, evidently divine, "*Love one another.*"

From this maxim of mutual love, the excellence of which none will be found to dispute, St. Simon draws this inference, the excellence of which is equally indisputable. "Religion ought to guide society to the great object of ameliorating, as speedily as possible, the condition of the largest and most indigent class." We may think that we need no whimsical old Frenchman to draw this inference for us, or to invent a new Christianity for its enforcement. But our ignorance needs enlightenment, for on this inference hang the new law and the new prophets. It is the New Revelation in three lines; and contains religious unity, priestly infallibility, permanence of worship, morality, influence of the doctrine. Do we want priests for the new worship? It requires no proof that they must be the men most capable of contributing by their labours to the amelioration of the greatest and poorest class. Nothing is required but to discover these most able men, and to regulate the hierarchy of them. But this nothing may turn out hereafter, to present an unexpected difficulty. The author of the system was contented with pure speculation, and left it to others who followed him to find out the practical application. The experience of a few years brought the difficulties of the attempt into high relief, and it was found impossible to construct the required hierarchy of ability.

. It is acknowledged that the critical portion of the work is far more able than the constructive portion. St. Simon speaks out plainly. He accuses the Pope and his Church of a triple heresy; in the imperfect

education of the laity; in the false direction given to the instruction of ecclesiastical students, and the consequent ignorance and incapacity of the priests; and in the patronage, or connivance, afforded to two institutions outrageously at variance with the spirit of Christianity;—the Inquisition, and the Order of Jesuits. These three fundamental errors are held to be destructive of the fundamental principle of the Christian religion, that is of the maxim, “love one another:” and therefore incompatible with the duty of ameliorating the condition of the largest and poorest class of society.

But if the Pope is a heretic, so is Luther. The great reformer is indictable on many counts. First, because, when the world was at his feet, he adopted a system of morals far lower than the one which the actual civilization of the world required; and because he failed to obey the command of our Saviour by organizing the human race for the benefit of the largest and poorest class. Secondly, because he established an inferior mode of worship; omitting to muster in support of his reformation, all the seductive arts, poetry, music, and sculpture; and depriving his followers of the illusion of the senses, and of the scenic emotion, of which Catholicism had ably availed itself. Thirdly, Luther is open to the charge of requiring the reading of the Bible, and the Bible alone; a study, as St. Simon maintained, often demoralising, prolific in revelations of human turpitude, frequently too metaphysical, and one of the causes, not the least active, of the misty follies of the German philosophies. The Pope and Luther then,

are equally heretical ; because they both departed from the great religious axiom, the essential aim of every law and of every dogma, the amelioration of the physical condition of the largest and poorest class of mankind.

To re-establish Christianity, says St. Simon, we must restore that influence of the senses, the absence of which has cursed its social action with sterility. The expression of Jesus Christ, "my kingdom is not of this world," ill understood and worse applied, had led in the Romish church, to a perpetual and obstinate struggle between matter and understanding, between body and spirit. This struggle is about to cease, since the new worship must make its appearance as at once social and religious, as at the same time sensuous and spiritual.

This is the new Christianity, from which the disciples deduced first, the two or three leading maxims of their faith ; then the appeal to men of capacity to concur in the mighty task of religious and social renovation ; afterwards that apostolate of persuasion and love, that new communion of martyrs wanting in nothing but cruel executions ; finally, the old but forgotten principle of fraternal affection, the base of the new social organization, destined to replace military force by pacific union, and to disband the army in order to incorporate the working classes.

Jesus Christ, say the disciples, has prepared universal fraternity, St. Simon has accomplished it. The truly universal church is about to appear, and the reign of Cæsar is at an end. Science is holy, industry is holy.

Priests, men of science, and industrials, constitute society. The leaders of the priests, the leaders of the men of science, the leaders of the industrials, constitute the government. All property is church property, every vocation is a religious function, a grade in the social hierarchy. On these principles is founded the well-known maxim of the sect: *to every one according to the capacity; to every capacity according to its works.*

Such, in general terms, is the New Christianity. It came into the world almost from the deathbed of its inventor. St. Simon's health was failing at the time he wrote this his last work. Disfigured by the wound he had himself inflicted, so devoid of resources that he was barely existing by the cold aid of charity, oppressed by want and overwhelmed with debts, the diseased and disappointed philosopher exhibited a calmness and serenity that half justify his disciples' eulogy on the "modern Socrates." The disorder, however, gained ground; and during two months prevented the old man from swallowing any solid food: but though the body wasted away, the mind retained its energy. Notwithstanding the long-continued neglect and contempt to which he had been a prey, notwithstanding his destitution and the immediate prospect of death, his invention was busily at work to find the means of bringing his last ideas before the public. He meditated a journal, to be called the *Producteur*, but death cut short his intention. He died surrounded by some of his disciples, and among others, Auguste Comte and Olinde Rodrigues.

A few years later the circumstances of his death were published by some who were present. Conscious that the curtain of his futurity was about to be drawn up, he called his intimate friends around him and thus addressed them. "During the last twelve days, my friends, I have been considering the best mode of securing success to our proposed journal; for the last three hours, I have been desirous, notwithstanding my sufferings, to give you the result of my reflections. You have reached a period in which well-combined efforts will lead to an immense result. . . . The pear is ripe, you may gather it. . . . The last of my labours, the *New Christianity*, will not be understood at once. A notion has prevailed, that all religion must disappear, because it has been conclusively shown that the Catholic system is worn out. People are deceived: religion cannot disappear from the world; it is only transformed. . . . Rodrigues, do not forget this! and remember that to accomplish great things, passion is needful. . . . All my life may be summed up in a single thought: to secure to all men the freest development of their faculties." After a few minutes' silence, the dying man added, "Forty-eight hours after our second publication, the sect of workers will be constituted: the future is ours." After this, putting his hand to his head, he died. Here was indeed, "the ruling passion strong in death."

It is interesting to inquire what was the impression made by this scene on the minds of the disciples. The *Doctrine de St. Simon*, opens thus. "When the

Producteur was commenced in 1825, Saint Simon had just died. Full of admiration for the sublime doctrine which had brought on our master the annoyances, the contempt, the insults, with which he had been overwhelmed, we devoted ourselves to its propagation: we were impressed with the importance of this great mission, we foresaw the obstacles we should have to overcome. Certain of being regarded at first as dreamers, of seeing the men of enlightenment cast upon us, from the heights of their greatness, glances of pity and perhaps of augor, we resigned ourselves to brave the opinion of persons, who seeing society divided into two camps, would misunderstand our intentions, and regard us as deserters." This remark applies to the political sentiments then prevailing. The new school refused to belong to the ultra-liberal party, while it would, of course, be disowned by the priestly party.

The question that now pressed was, how the *Producteur* should attain to publication. The disciples were young men, better provided with zeal and talent, than with money. They were convinced that they could not expect such a sale as to support the work, even though it were written and edited gratuitously. They applied to some monied men who had rendered previous assistance to their master, and by their help, with that of their own private friends, a joint stock company was formed. To facilitate the sale, the *Producteur*, which was published weekly, was not confined to the propagation of the new doctrine, but contained also, information on art and industrial statistics. This hybrid form,

however, proved unsuccessful : the public laughed at the doctrinal part ; and the articles on 'art made thoughtless people gape, while better instructed people sneered at them as superficial and inaccurate. The journal now became a monthly one, and was limited to the propagation of the *New Christianity*. The disciples were young and ardent men, and soon enjoyed their anticipated martyrdom ; being characterized by some as dreamers, and ranked by others in that class of beardless youths who desired to dominate the world. The new school attracted considerable attention.

The *Producteur*, however, made little way ; and economically as it was managed, a year exhausted the pecuniary resources of the conductors. It would have required 200*l.* a year to pay the loss, if additional subscribers could not be obtained. Besides, the authors who wrote it, being all of them engaged in earning their livelihood in other avocations, found their health giving way under the double duty they performed. The *Producteur* was therefore stopped. This cessation however, was indirectly of advantage, by leading those interested in the new school, to put themselves in personal communication with the disciples. The authors of the *Doctrine*, thus express themselves. "A correspondence of a truly *apostolic* nature, was opened with the newly initiated : they invoked the spirit of St. Simon to direct them in the midst of the perplexity produced in their sentiments and ideas by this new doctrine, which attacking all their prejudices, called them to a complete regeneration." This passage has a mystical, and almost

a blasphemous savour: though to Roman Catholics, accustomed to the invocation of saints, it may appear less shocking. The result of the conferences was, that the number of the sect greatly multiplied; each of the original apostles being able to boast that he had added to the church as many disciples as the entire number assembled around St. Simon's deathbed. Most of the sect at this time appear to have been young and enthusiastic men, in search of something more satisfactory than the prevalent sceptical philosophy. We find included, some names since of great note; such, for instance, as Auguste Comte, already mentioned, Michel Chevalier, and Carnot.

The two leading members appear to have been MM. Bazard and Enfantin: M. Bazard assuming the name of St. Amand. A room was engaged, and regular lectures were given, as a complete explanation of the faith. M. Enfantin seems to have been an imaginative, enthusiastic person, constantly urging on his more cool associate, M. Bazard, who had had more experience; and who as a keen politician and as one who had suffered banishment for political offences, knew the difficulties to be surmounted.

The lectures began by lamenting the unhappy circumstances in which European society is placed; a foundation assumed by the teachers of all the new social doctrines. Everywhere are seen strife and disorder. There is anarchy in politics, dividing men in the names of power and of liberty: anarchy in the sciences which have no common bond to unite them:

anarchy in industry which is a prey to competition: anarchy in the fine arts which languish for the want of fertilizing inspiration. But the new doctrine invites men to assume "a bond of affection, of doctrine, and of activity which may unite them: and lead them to advance in peace, with order and love, to a destiny in common; and which may confer on society, on the globe itself, and on the whole universe, a character of union, wisdom, and beauty." The lecturer appealed for proof of these general statements, to the facts of history: he endeavoured to show how the human race had advanced to the era of St. Simon, through periods of egotism and of atheism: he based his system on the nature of man, and found in it the justification of an irresistible tendency to association. He then inquired who was to be the father of this future race, what city was to have the initiation of the new order of things, what was to be the city of progress in modern times, as Jerusalem, imperial Rome, and Christian Rome, were in former days.

All this appears to an Englishman, wild and unconnected, more fit to be put into verse by a third-rate poet, than to be declaimed by a man of ability to educated men. Yet the audience seems to have consisted principally, of men of positive science, of former pupils of the Polytechnic school. We next are made acquainted with the favourite phrases which haunt us at every corner of the St. Simonian writings. First, we are told that up to this time, man has everywhere been the subject of *exploitation* by man. This word exploitation

may be strange to many persons who are tolerably familiar with French literature.

If we want to put into French, the expression, to work a mine, we must use the verb *exploiter*. If a Frenchman speaks of the *exploitation d'une clientèle*, he means something which I am unable to express without a periphrasis. Suppose a man dies leaving an established business, with habitual customers; the successor in the business is said, *exploiter la clientèle*. We see from these examples, what is meant by the phrase, *l'exploitation de l'homme par l'homme*. A capitalist, according to this view, uses a workman as he uses a mine; he gets all he can out of him. The employer of labour is assumed to have practically, such a command over his servants, as to enable him to squeeze out of them all the work they are capable of rendering: and it is implied that the maintenance given as remuneration, is the least that is necessary to keep the labourer in health and vigour.

In some countries it is no doubt true, that the labourer does work to his utmost power, for a very small payment. This may be said of Ireland, and with something like equal truth, of France. In the French country places, wages appear to be about 9*d.* a day, where wages are paid. In Ireland now, I suppose, they are at least as high as 9*d.*, even as to the worst parts of the island. In these two countries, then, if anywhere, the *exploitation* of man by man may seem complete. But in the United States the case is far different, and we may say that there is in those parts, as much *exploit-*

tation of the employer by the labourer, as of the servant by the master. Even in England, where country wages are twice as high as in France, with provisions only a little dearer, and where the town population is commonly very well paid, any exploitation of man by man can scarcely be alleged.

But St. Simon, and most of the other theoretical social writers, like true Frenchmen, assume that their own country is the world. Wages are low in France; therefore they are low everywhere. The indigent are turned over to private charity in France, therefore they are turned over to private charity everywhere. The disciples then, say in general terms, without any exception for England, or for the free States of North America; "In characterizing the great difference which separates the past from the future, we have especially insisted on this:—That the social state in all past times was founded, in a greater or less degree, on the *exploitation* of men by men; that the most important progress of the present day is to put an end to this state of things, under whatever form it may be conceived."

I have already stated the object proposed by St. Simon; viz., to ameliorate the condition of the most numerous and poorest class of society: we have also seen what, as he thought, was the cause of the evils which that class suffered; viz., the exploitation of it by the richer and more powerful classes. But another cause he assigned for these evils was the fact of our living in an unfortunate period.

St. Simon was a diligent student of history, and it

is not denied that his notions on the subject were penetrating and original. The same vanity that made him tell Madame de Staël that he was the most remarkable man of his generation, led him also to the declaration that Guizot had borrowed his ideas and produced them as his own. There are men, he said, who think and invent; there are others who vulgarise, or popularise, the ideas of the thinkers. Bayle thought, and Voltaire popularised Bayle: St. Simon thought, and Guizot popularised St. Simon.

A favourite notion of St. Simon, was, that history may be divided into critical periods and organic periods. The critical periods are those in which the minds of men are employed in investigating the principles of the Government under which they live, and in endeavouring to amend old institutions, or to invent new ones. Such periods are remarkable for discontent, constant change, and anarchy. But in organic periods, when society is disciplined, the actual institutions give satisfaction to the world, and men's minds are at rest. We live in one of the critical periods, in a time of transition from one organization to another: and this fact accounts for much of the misery that exists.

St. Simon, reasoning from the past, reads the book of the future, and tells us for our satisfaction, that this misery will be removed by means of an universal association. If it is objected to him that such an association is unexampled in the history of the world, he replies that society formerly was organized with a view to war; but that the higher destiny of the future

will lead to an organization for peace: that in the ninth century, before the feudal system prevailed, there existed the same licence and competition that now prevail; so that province fought against province, castle against castle, town against town. But the feudal system brought towns, castles, and provinces, into subjection, and gave them a warlike organization. Peace hereafter shall also have its triumphs; and universal pacific association shall secure such an organization, as will remove the anarchical competition that causes the exploitation of man by man, and which prevents the happiness of the largest and poorest class.

But of all the stock phrases that distinguish the system, the best known is; "To every man according to his capacity; to every capacity according to its works." This maxim must convince every one that the system is neither democratic nor communistic. In a purely democratic society, equality of all men is the thing especially aimed at; and a hierarchy of capacity is as much detested as a hierarchy of riches. Among the pure communists, a labourer is not to be rewarded according to what he performs; but all the members are to work for the benefit of all. The individual is to be merged in the community. When we come to the actual organization proposed by St. Simon, we shall see how he applies this maxim as to capacity and work.

Private property then, is to be continued, and inequality of property is to be permitted and even organized. The man of the highest ability and greatest

application, is to have the greatest possessions. But there is one custom, which has prevailed almost universally; and which, if continued, is fatal to the proposed arrangements. If a society were commenced on the principles laid down, and were successfully carried on a few years, each member would have a certain amount of property, consisting either of land and other realty assigned to him, or of effects resulting from his own labour. One of the richest members dies: what is to become of his property? Shall his son succeed to it?

If the custom of inheritance is allowed to prevail, there is an end of the principle, "to every one according to his capacity." If indeed, capacity were transmitted from father to son, just as property is, inheritance would naturally form a part of the St. Simonian system: there would be an aristocracy of birth; and certain families being endowed by nature with the highest capacities, would be furnished by the society with a corresponding superfluity of property. But unfortunately, the ablest men have sometimes the weakest sons, and the best men may have the deep mortification of seeing their sons run riot in wickedness. Some great men indeed, have enjoyed the rare happiness of leaving successors who have followed in their sires' footsteps: the first Fox and the first Pitt, were succeeded by Ministers who rivalled their fathers' greatness. But how different was the fate of the philanthropic Howard! and what results would have followed if that great man's feeble offspring had

been huddled into his father's succession, with the hope that he would have continued his father's labours of love! One of two things then must happen under the new system: the hierarchy of capacity must be abandoned, or the custom of inheritance must be abolished. Inventors never hesitate in such an alternative. St. Simon and his followers denounced the custom of inheritance, as one of the darkest corruptions of the day. All the other privileges of birth, they say, have disappeared: this privilege of inheritance alone remains: it also, is destined to fall.

Few persons will be found to hold the right of inheritance as sacred as the right of property. When a man dies, some one must succeed to his possessions; and nothing seems more natural, more in accordance with the common sense of mankind, than that the inheritance should pass to those persons who are most nearly allied to the deceased, by blood and affection. But this rule must be subjected to the test of utility. Even in the case of present possession, the interests of society are allowed to modify the right of the individual. If I had recovered a tract of land from the sea, I should not be allowed to do absolutely what I pleased with it. A threatened invasion would justify the Government in taking possession of my new fields for a camp, or in cutting my dykes and restoring the dominion of the ocean. A far less pressing necessity, a proposed canal or railroad, would furnish a sufficient ground for taking my property from me. Money compensation, no doubt, would in every possible case

be made; but however insufficient such a compensation may be to my feelings, I am not left at liberty to accept or refuse it. Society does not grant to its members, an absolute and uncontrolled right to any property whatsoever.

But what is true of present possession, is still more true of inheritance: children are generally, far from having an absolute and uncontrolled right of succeeding to their parents. Under the old laws of Europe, land passed to the eldest son, to the exclusion of his brothers and sisters, as, in cases of intestacy, it still passes among ourselves. In Scotland, at the present day, a son who is not the eldest, having land left him by his father, may enjoy the usufruct, but cannot make a title for sale without incurring vexatious difficulties. With regard to personalty, we all know that we may bequeath it as we like, in England, whereas in France and in many of the United States, the children have a legal claim to the inheritance of a deceased father, as indeed they have to the inheritance of the land. Nor, at the present day, can any of us leave our property in the hands of trustees, to accumulate for a long term of years, in favour of a distant posterity. It seems therefore, that while we recognize the principle, that the property of a deceased person ought to descend to his friends, we limit the application of the principle by the consideration of what seems most likely to be of utility to the whole community: in England, where individualism predominates, giving uncontrolled power to bequeath personalty to any living person a man

may select, but as to realty, reserving a preference to the eldest son; while in more democratic countries, the dislike of oligarchical pretensions, and the desire of all possible equality among citizens, leads to a forced distribution of the property among all the children.

St. Simon was equally opposed to all these arrangements, because under all of them, men become possessed of property in very unequal proportions. A man of high ability and of persevering application inherits nothing, but is thrown entirely upon his own resources: an empty-headed idler is heir to a princely fortune. A Southey toils and suffers until his faithful wife finds her reason worn out by long-continued anxieties: a fox-hunting squire, who is unable to get a pass degree, enjoys the rental of a whole parish. This is the very reverse of the maxim which assigns remuneration according to capacity and labour.

But would it be really advantageous, or possible, to carry out this principle of enriching ability and industry, and of impoverishing imbecility and apathy? In a small community, where individual interest is sunk in patriotism, in a little society established for the purpose of carrying into practice the whimsical reveries of an enthusiast, almost anything is practicable for a time. But in a great nation, and among all the roughnesses of a hard every-day world, would such poetical justice be feasible? leaving out of consideration the important question, if feasible, would it be desirable?

Among all the wild theories which I have met with, I am not aware of one which decries industry and

pronounces it unnecessary. The claims of industry and the sufferings of the industrious are generally the burden of the reformer's song. But take away the right of inheritance, say to every man, work as hard as you please, at your death your children will not enjoy the fruits of your toil, one great motive to perseverance would be taken away. Among the labouring classes, it is true, many men think of little but the present, or at any rate, their providence does not extend beyond the furnishing a resource in case of illness: they do not commonly accumulate a fund for their children, nor even insure their lives as a protection for their widows: they are contented to leave to their successors the laborious course they have themselves pursued. But the question of inheritance does not affect this class; for at present, since there is no property, there is nothing to bequeath. It is among the thrifty mechanics and the middle classes especially that savings take place, and it is among them that this matter assumes a high importance.

Why is it that the foreman or clerk strives to become a partner; that the man of competent fortune sacrifices years in visiting distant countries, submitting during months to inhabit a floating prison with the risk of being drowned; that the manufacturer toils on to the end of his days, subject to all the irritating annoyances caused by fractious and unsympathizing workmen; that the medical man makes his feeble rounds among his patients, when conscious that he is himself stricken with mortal disease? All these things are done, not

merely to attain the self-gratulation of wealth, the enjoyment of luxury, the glitter of ostentation: they arise fully as much from an anxious desire to protect the wife and children that may be left behind; to shield them from want or humiliating dependence. Take away inheritance, and such self-sacrifice receives its death-blow.

But if industry is important, so also is a habit of saving. It is the fashion among the new theorists to abuse capital, and to attribute to the owners of it, the miseries that the working classes endure. But these very classes would be far worse off if capital disappeared. Labourers themselves are fully aware of the difference between having two men seeking one master, and two masters seeking one man. If capital were diminished, the means of employing and paying labourers would be diminished; masters would be in greater demand than workmen; work would be scarce, and wages would fall. Such obvious truths are too trite and dull to be entertained in the minds of great social reformers; but men of common-place character may be excused if they revert to them. When the means of maintaining life are in question, plain common sense may be endured for an instant.

The accumulation of capital then, is of the highest importance to the labouring classes. Without it, new land could not be broken up in the colonies; an enlarged supply of food would be impossible; population would be confined within its present narrow limits; and we should suffer all the evils that, with

our present imperfect civilization, attend on a stationary condition: competition for work, scanty wages, insufficient food, misery and despondency, discontent and disorder. All these fearful ills are warded off, or mitigated, by the constant accumulation of capital, which overflowing the actual field of employment, carries population and cultivation into ever enlarging territories. A superabundance of capital, then, constantly pressing on the means of employment, ought to be the thing desired by that largest and poorest class, the object of St. Simon's philanthropical attentions.

But take away the right of private inheritance, and you give the heaviest possible blow to accumulation. There is a class of men, I grant, who take a pleasure in saving for its own sake. In old times such persons heaped up their bags of gold and silver, and narrowed their pleasures to the counting and re-counting their precious hoard: in modern times they gloat over their three per cents. and railway scrip and mortgages. Their pleasure is in present possession, and they care little to whom their beloved treasures will descend when the grave receives their own bodies. But if capital were accumulated by such men alone, the world of labour would advance slowly. Most men love money, not for its own sake, but for that which it will buy: pleasure, personal importance, or power; a well-furnished table, a glittering equipage, a seat in Parliament, a possible title. Most men, however, have some affection for their family, some pride in seeing them advanced in society, some shame at the thought of

leaving them in want. Few men but would be saddened if they could see in the glass of futurity, their wife in want, their daughters earning their bread in humiliation, their sons, servants to those whom they formerly commanded. The fear of such a catastrophe leads us to insure our lives, to cut off superfluous expenses, to restrain our desires, that we may make provision for those whom we feel to be a part of ourselves. But if we knew that after all our struggles for self-control, after all the sacrifices we had made, our hardly-earned accumulations were not to descend to our wife and children, we should cast prudence to the winds, and say, let us eat and drink for to-morrow we die. Take away either security of property or security of inheritance, and the very spring of accumulation is dried up. Trite truths, strangely overlooked by the vain and wilful minds of the great social reformers !

It is tolerably clear even in the absence of any experience, that an attempt to abolish family inheritance, would be met by numerous evasions. A man stricken with mortal sickness, would distribute his property: to this son a house, to that a field, to a third a sum of money. The law might step in and enact that any such gifts made within so many weeks or months of death should be illegal, and might call upon the receivers to refund the property they had received. There might then spring up a custom of distribution during the health of the parent. In England sometimes, a man, to avoid the legacy and probate duties, executes a deed of gift, by which he makes over to his children, all he

possesses, retaining the usufruct and control of his property during his lifetime. To prevent such an evasion the law might declare that no such deed should be binding. Resort might then be had to the practice of making over the property to the children, taking a legal obligation to pay a certain annuity during the lifetime of the parent. If this also were forbidden, the parent might distribute his possessions, reserving so much as would furnish the income he required; or he might sink a portion in a life annuity, and divide the rest. I see only one way of strictly carrying out the law; that is to forbid parents, during their lives, to render any pecuniary assistance to their children. Would the fanaticism of even a social theorist, go to such a length as this? Short of such an enactment, nothing could prevent parental affection from being more than a match for the harshness of law. But cruel as it would seem, to declare that it should be a penal offence for a parent to bestow any succour or indulgence on his child, the necessity of the case would justify it, if you were determined to carry out your fundamental maxim as to capacity and industry. For putting the question of inheritance aside, a parent by bestowing a portion of his income on his children, would raise them above other children who experienced no such liberality; and thus the balance between capacity and labour on one hand, and reward on the other, would be disturbed.

SECTION III.—Organization—Not democratic—An aristocracy, but not of birth—The so-called religion—Division of society into three grades—Government—Punishment of criminals—Position of women—Misrepresentation in Chamber of Deputies, in 1830—Titles of publications.

I will now try to explain by what organization it was proposed to carry out these peculiar views. The new sect strongly disclaimed any sympathy with the democratic party opposed to the French Government under Charles X. In the *Doctrine de St. Simon*, we find, "In refusing the name of liberals or ultras, our political opinions would be at first incomprehensible; and yet, to set free sentiments, science, and industry, from all the fetters that hinder their progress, such was our desire; but we had also to show that new ties were necessary to give order to efforts, to direct all social activity to one end: here was lost the mind of men to whom the word enfranchisement suggests nothing but revolt, and the mind of those who shudder when they hear the term social direction: the representatives of effete opinions would call us radicals, revolutionists, whilst the defenders of the so-called new opinions, but which already, for us, belong to the past, would call us Egyptians, Ultramontanes, Jesuits."

The St. Simonians, then, belonged to no political party; and least of all were they democrats. We shall find, on looking at the organization they aimed at, that they were by no means monarchists: the only superiority they were willing to bow before, being a superiority of capacity; and monarchy of an hereditary

kind, being therefore peculiarly distasteful to them. If they grudged a man the possession of property accumulated by the labour and self-denial of his parents, and required that the State should be the heir of all its members, much more would they condemn the practice of heaping on one head, riches and authority, the sceptre and the crown, the sanction of the Church and all the divinity that does hedge a king, only because the poor mortal so distinguished, happened to be of royal birth.

For the same reason did they condemn an aristocracy of blood. So long, would they say, as real superiority attached to certain families: so long as a knightly education conferred on its pupils those bodily powers and that equestrian skill which were essential to success in battle: and whilst also, all the arrangements of society had reference to war and strife; the accomplishments of peace being despised and thought fit for none but women and priests: so long was an aristocracy of birth natural and inevitable. But in our own days all this is changed. Among us, peace is the main business of our lives, fighting and war are the interlude: we do not make peace as a mere refreshment after war; but we regard war as an occasional evil, necessary to support our pacific pursuits. This alteration of our views, together with the vast changes that have unhorsed the mailed warrior, and have given to science and riches the predominance in war, have deprived the aristocracies of the earth of their ancient superiority in battle; of their right to command armies; and there-

fore, of their claim to be placed over the heads of men. Why should we speak with bated breath, before a man as pervious to pistol-shot as ourselves; why practise a whispering humbleness in the presence of those who on the great stage of affairs have no visible or recondite superiority? "To every man according to his capacity."

The St. Simonian organization then, is not a monarchy, nor an aristocracy of birth, nor a democracy. It has been said to be a theocracy; but it is of so peculiar a conformation that no name exactly expresses it. I should rather say, that it is properly, an aristocracy; as being a government of the best men; and therefore opposed to an oligarchy, which is a government of the few and rich: a distinction not merely of words, but practically understood in old Greece. The following rant contains the whole mystery.

"Moses has promised men universal fraternity; Jesus Christ has prepared it; *St. Simon* has realized it. At last, the *truly universal church* is about to arise; the reign of Cæsar is at end; a pacific society takes the place of a military society; hereafter the *universal church* governs the temporal as well as the spiritual, the exterior court as well as the interior. Science is holy, industry is holy, for they enable men to ameliorate the lot of the poorest class, and to bring it nearer to God. Priests, savans, industrials, constitute society. The heads of the priests, the heads of the savans, the heads of the industrials, constitute the government. All property is the property of the church, and every

avocation is a religious function, a grade in the social hierarchy. To every man according to his capacity, to every capacity according to its works. The reign of God arrives upon the earth. All the prophecies are accomplished."

We cannot wonder that a social organization like this, recommended in such mystical and fantastical terms, should be called a theocracy, or a theosophy. But before assenting to this nomenclature, it is better to ask what is the religion that is to pervade the whole of the new society; whether it is what we usually understand by that name? Before now, strange things have been said and done in the sacred name of religion.

The *Doctrine de St. Simon* enters on this subject in various places, and sometimes in a rather apologetical tone. The reason of the hesitation felt, is not, as an English reader would suppose, on account of the disregard shown to the established faith of Christian churches, but on account of the contempt that the writers know they shall incur in Paris, for professing any belief at all. "Our five last sittings are entirely devoted to the solution of the problem, *has humanity a religious future?* It was necessary for us, above all, to repel the objections that have for their base the hatred in which all the religions of the past are enveloped; a hatred which predominates still, if not in the youth of the present generation, at least among the worn-out pupils of Voltaire and the encyclopædia; among our modern metaphysicians and physiologists, who analyse mind and dissect matter, without any solici-

tude as to the tie which unites them, or rather as to the life of which both are only manifestations."

"We ought then, to restore the religious sentiment, and the various institutions that it has conceived and founded, by showing the influence that these have exerted, during periods of greater or less extent, on the gradual progress of humanity towards universal association," &c., &c.

In another passage, the character of religion is claimed for the new philosophy. "Another name of still higher importance is reserved for it, a name which all the doctrines that have guided the people, have successively taken and quitted: that of religion. Thus the philosophers of Greece and of Italy, after having long pursued, and at last felt, the void in which their interminable discussions were agitated, all of them at last rallied to the voice of Christ, and the Christian religion was established; and during three centuries the Christians, renouncing their communion, have deserted the Church to form philosophical schools, which have become extinct in their turn, like those of Athens and of Rome, and are tending unwittingly towards the new Church."

The reason by which St. Simon justified his desire of restoring religion, is thus stated in his own words, addressed to the savans at an early period of his philosophical career.

"Since the fifteenth century till the present day, the institution which united the European countries, which put a bridle on the ambition of nations and of kings,

has been gradually weakened ; at present it is utterly destroyed ; and a general war, a frightful war, a war which threatens to swallow up all the population of Europe, has already existed twenty years, and has mowed down many millions of men. You alone can reorganize European society. Time presses, blood is flowing : hasten your decision."

Again, we find in the *Doctrine*, "Assuredly, we make no pretension to heroism, in introducing you to the basis of a new religion : we know that in this indulgent or indifferent age, all opinions may exhibit themselves without danger, especially so long as they confine themselves within the limits of a school of philosophy ; but we know also that we are addressing men who found their superiority on their incredulity, and who reserve a smile of contempt for all religious ideas, which they banish to the times of darkness, into what they call the barbarism of the middle ages and the infancy of the human race. This smile we do not fear to encounter : the Voltairian sarcasms, the proud disdain of modern materialism, may be likely enough to crush in men's hearts that vague sentimentality which in the present day we sometimes see shooting out ; they may serve very well to alarm and confound that kind of individual religiosity which searches in vain for forms by which to appear : but they are powerless to shake a profound conviction."

After reading such a decided profession of piety, such a philippic as that from which I have quoted, against the scépticism or atheism of the age, we inquire with

interest, what are the dogmas of the new faith. The result is surprising: We are first told that all society is divided into *priests*, savans, and industrials; we afterwards find that society is divided into *artists*, savans, and industrials: the inference is inevitable; priests and artists are the same thing. From this we come to the conclusion that religion and the fine arts are the same thing. But if so, why this tirade against the religious incredulity of the age? That I may not be misapprehended, I will give the very words of the *Doctrine*.

I have already quoted one passage, to the effect that "*Priests*, savans, and industrials, constitute society. The heads of the priests, the heads of the savans, the heads of the industrials, constitute the government." In another place we are told, "Society in future, we have said, will be composed of *artists*, savans, and industrials; there will be then, three kinds of education, or rather, education will be divided into three branches, which will have for their object to develope: the one, sympathy, the source of the fine arts; another the rational faculty, the instrument of science; the third finally, material activity, the instrument of industry."

"And as society presents the triple face of fine arts, science, and industry, only because the individuals who compose it, possess each of them the three faculties of which the predominant development of one alone constitutes the artist, the savant, or the industrial; as every individual, whatever may be his special tendency, is nevertheless always loving, endowed with intelligence,

and material activity, it follows that all will be the object of a triple teaching, from their infancy until their classification in the three great divisions of the social body; and that even then, each of these divisions of the active generation will continue his moral, intellectual, and physical education, according to the special aim laid down for it."

It is clear then, that the priest and the artist are the same person, and that religion and the fine arts are synonymous terms. A hint of explanation, so obscure as to make us only desire more light, is given in another passage. "According to this classification, the magistracy, in a penal point of view, is then divided into three orders, as well as the penal code; and these three orders correspond to the three great social orders, which for us are not monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy, but artists, savans, and industrials; and, we repeat it, we use provisionally this word artist, because the one which we should like to employ would doubtless be ill understood in the present day." What can this magic word be? Considering the boldness in other respects, of the writers, this word they shrink from using, must needs be one to set our hair on end: surely not the word priest; that they have used before.

The passages I have quoted however, must have suggested that the word artist is not here intended to convey what we commonly understand by it. Afterwards, we have this explanation: "Such is the mission of men whom, out of consideration for the prejudices of the age that hears us, we have called artists.

Artists, to us, are men who have unceasingly impressed on humanity the progressive movement, which has advanced it from a state of the grossest brutality to the degree of civilization that we have attained; and at this very moment, the men worthy of the name are those to whom has been unveiled the secret of social destinies; and this secret has been unveiled to them only because their love of mankind has furnished them with an imperious motive for discovering it. But it is only when artists have spoken, when they have pierced the curtain which separates us from the future, that science starting from this revelation as from a grand hypothesis, *justifies* it by the connection which, under the empire of this hypothesis, it shows to exist in the facts of the *past*, and by the foresight which this new conception of universal order permits it to systematize for the future."

It is amusing to see the different view of this matter taken by Auguste Comte, once a disciple, but become a schismatic. M. Comte, says the *Doctrine*, takes an opposite view of the duty of artists. According to him, it is for the men of science to discover the plan of social futurity. But he assigns an important post to the artists. For the scientific men, he says, attain only to a frigid combination, and are unable to recommend their notions to the world. The help of artists is indispensable, "because the *impartial* work of the savans, who must seek and discover the law of human development, in accordance with historic facts, *would only produce in their minds an obstinate conviction, without*

enabling them to crush the egotism which predominates over them as over the rest of society."

We see, then, that by the word artists, is not meant painters or sculptors, much less dancers or musicians. We are to understand by it, all those in whom sympathy is strongly developed, or rather who have the power to excite sympathy in others. We should, of course, place poets in this class; and we find the following note. "Those who have read with attention the different parts of the doctrine explained in this work, will conceive that two names especially belong, *in the past*, to the function of which we are here speaking: these names are those of poets and of priests, corresponding, the one to critical periods, the other to organic periods; and in fact, the mission of the poet, like that of the priest, has always been to draw the masses towards the realization of the future which it sang or preached; of which they themselves were the most powerful interpreters, because they were most strongly animated by it: *the future* will blend these functions in a single one; for the highest poetry will be at the same time the most powerful preaching."

It may be true, as has been frequently maintained, that poets have been the great civilizers of mankind. In barbarous ages, when men did not, and could not, read, the bards who sang the deeds of the past, and recounted the "tales of hapless love and glory won, that roused the fearful and subdued the proud," may have been the great instruments in "causing the past, the distant, and the future, to predominate over the

present, and thus raising men in the dignity of thinking beings." But it would be hard to believe that poets play the same important part among us. Let us give what definition of poetry we may, whether it is or is not such as shall exclude Pope and Horace, we shall with difficulty be brought to conclude that poets occupy a very high position in the affairs of the world. Far be it from me to depreciate the efforts of genius, to treat lightly the treasures that have been handed down to us, or to think slightly of the works of modern times. Pure is the pleasure, great is the moral improvement, that I have derived from perusing them. I only deprecate the exaggeration that would exalt them to a position which our days cannot, I think, assign them, as the direct leaders of society. We may be told that I narrow the meaning of poetry too much, that it is not to be understood as confined to rhythmical compositions, and that some of the greatest poets virtually, have wanted "the faculty of verse." Many orators, it may be said, many prose writers, many thinkers who write nothing, are poets; and any definition which would exclude St. Simon, would unquestionably be too confined. I can only say, that if this is what is intended, the *Doctrine* is quite right in not using the word poet as equivalent to priest: and that perhaps it is even better to use the word artist, although it may be subject to much misapprehension.

Such then, was to be the new organization of society: men were to be divided into three classes: the highest capacities were to be artists; the medium capacities

were to be scientific men ; the lowest capacities were to sink into industrials, and were to perform the manual and laborious offices of society, were "to sweat all day in the eye of Phœbus." It was maintained that under such an arrangement all contentions would be at an end ; that the men of highest ability, finding themselves at the head of society and enjoying the largest remuneration, would of course have every reason to rejoice ; while those of less intellect and imagination, being placed in a position where their acknowledged powers would come into play, would have nothing to complain of ; that the large class who have no taste for bookish pursuits, would be relieved from studies distasteful to them, and would be employed in those inferior occupations for which alone they were fitted. One great difficulty, however, must be manifest to every one : who was to assort men according to their abilities ? who was to be the examiner, the judge, in so delicate a matter ? And is it conceivable that the middle and lowest classes would acquiesce in a verdict that assigned the highest rewards to others, and left to themselves the more laborious occupations, a less honourable position, and smaller remuneration ? If, indeed, men had the gift desired by Burns, to see themselves as others see them, together with such humility and so strong a sense of justice, as to render them contented in a subordinate condition ; if those decreed by the examining tribunal to bodily labour, were contented to act as workmen and servants for the benefit of their clever brothers and cousins, for the benefit of men brought up on an

equality with themselves, but selected by the authorities as fit for the highest functions of the community; if no undue ambition were found to inhabit the minds of men of an inferior intellectual capacity; then this peace-giving scheme might be carried out without causing perpetual jealousies and contentions: and when men have arrived at such a degree of moral excellence as this, socialism, and government itself, will be needless.

The above remarks may be sufficient to give a notion of the organization proposed, and of the manifest difficulties that would arise in carrying it out. In the next section we shall see what were the results in the short experiment made by the disciples. But before entering on that part of the subject, I will mention a few points that struck me in perusing the *Doctrine*, and which may seem to complete the sketch of the principles laid down in that work.

First, as to the functions of government. The *Doctrine* says; "Legislation consists of two distinct parts; negative and positive, or penal and remunerative: this division gives it a double character, resulting from fear and hope: presenting itself with the first, as a hindrance to vice; with the second as a stimulus to virtue." We cannot wonder that the St. Simonians, with their peculiar views of merit and remuneration, should regard it as an important function of government to reward virtue: but we may venture to ask whether the attempt to do this, would really promote human excellence.

I do not mean to doubt that government may advantageously reward some kinds of excellence. In our own country, happily, education is not undertaken principally by the State: but where it is so, it clearly becomes the duty of the State to offer rewards to diligent and successful students. Some persons may even regard our Universities as a portion of our governmental constitution, and may look upon the numerous rewards those bodies confer on scholarship and science, as being really a government remuneration of excellence. But disregarding this refinement of reasoning, we may fairly say that our executive has at any rate commenced a system of rewards, by instituting examinations among candidates for appointments; and in some instances, not merely requiring a certain amount of acquirements, but also giving the situations to those who exhibit the highest merit. This, however, is purely a remuneration of capacity and knowledge, and not of virtue.

Again, every example of promotion by merit is a remuneration of excellence. A young officer in command of a troop of cavalry, dashes through the enemy, and finding himself surrounded, forms his men and gallantly cuts his way back again at their head; shewing a knowledge of his duty, brilliant courage, and presence of mind in danger. The government gives him a step in his profession: that is a reward for moral and intellectual excellence. A naval captain in command of a land battery, directs it with high ability, bears cold and wet with unshaken fortitude,

shrinks from no danger, and plays with an exploding shell as a boy with a cricket ball. The government promotes him, confers on him the order of the Bath, and decorates him with the cross reserved for the pre-eminently brave. These are rewards of moral and intellectual excellence.

In these and a thousand other cases, government does offer a stimulus to what may be called virtue; but it is virtue in action, and generally combined with some degree of intellectual superiority. Whether it would be desirable that rewards should be bestowed on men for goodness alone, may be a matter of doubt. Perhaps we should rejoice to see a worthy clergyman advanced in his profession, even if he were not distinguished for attainments beyond those of men generally: there being something in his vocation which makes mere goodness of the highest importance. A man whose business it is to teach virtue, needs above all things to be himself virtuous. But we should hesitate as to approval, if we found an administration offering rewards to laymen, to be competed for by proofs of superior moral excellence. A man who should offer himself as a candidate, would by that very act almost prove himself unfit for a prize. Modesty is the very foundation of goodness; and one who boasts of his own excellence, or who even shows a consciousness of it, thereby proclaims his own imperfection. When the St. Simonians then, desire that government should reward virtue, just as it punishes crime, they propose to do what would stimulate hypocrisy, and

what would confer distinction on self-asserting pride, to the neglect of modest merit.

One question urged upon the sect, seems to have caused some perplexity: I mean the kind of punishment to be inflicted on crime. "Without waiting for us to explain the nature of sentiments in the future, persons have desired to know our opinion on the repression of certain acts which we had already declared worthy of one day being regarded as immoral, as injurious to the progress of society, and as disallowed by it. People have gone further: they have prejudged our opinion as to the more or less severe forms that this repression would assume; and forgetting that we announced the close of the reign of violence, they have all but assumed that we kept in reserve, and as a last resort, the punishment of death, or at any rate, torture and the bayonet of the police." The quiet assumption of the end of the reign of violence, is sufficiently amusing. What we want to know is this: during the transition from the present rude state of mankind, to that blessed state of peace and good-will which is to be conferred on us, many gross crimes will be committed; robberies, violent assaults, homicides, wilful murders, will not cease at once; what is to be done with the offenders? In vain will you expect a reply.

In another passage we have an opinion feebly put forth. "We *think* that in a society constituted as those which we foresee in the future, the punishments inflicted on the propagators of anti-social doctrines" (what we of the old fashioned world call criminals) "will especially

aim at removing them from public animadversion. In denouncing them, power, by anticipating, will mitigate the popular hatred, which is so easily excited against men and things that wound the feelings of the mass. But to understand this idea, you must not forget that our first hypothesis as well as our only aim, is, to organize a power, loved, cherished, venerated. But whatever may be your momentary prejudices, could you believe, remembering the dogma of perfectibility generally received, that the human race, after having so long experienced the *respect* which attaches the feeble to the strong, the admiration impressed on intelligence by genius, the love which joyfully devotes itself for the man in whose life the destinies of a people, and of the whole world seem involved; could you believe that mankind is for ever disinherited from these noble sentiments? Be at your ease then, as to the severity of future punishments; when the power that inflicts them enjoys the confidence and love of the public, be convinced that it is more usual to celebrate its clemency than to groan over its rigour." It cannot be said there is any very definite opinion here expressed: nor do I think that any such opinion is necessary as to the punishments that will be required in that distant era which the St. Simonians foresee as the reign of love. When we arrive at a period within a thousand years of that era, we may begin to discuss the punishments that will be necessary. During the transition state, we may be content to go on with our present laws, amending them from time to time, and

adapting them to the increasing mildness of men's tempers.

One other matter remains to be explained, and it is one of great gravity: what is the proposed condition of women under this new law of love? The opinions in this respect, of St. Simon and of his immediate followers, have been misunderstood, and have been confounded with certain wild sentiments that, as we shall see, broke out of all bounds at the close of the sect's career. The language of the *Doctrine* in one passage, is very much that of other so-called reformers, but is not pushed to an extreme so as to justify any reproach as to the sentiments conveyed: "We have noticed, as one of the most important aspects of association, the relations that it establishes between the sexes: this point will be the object of a special development, in which we shall have to show how woman, at first a slave, or at least in a condition akin to servitude, becomes gradually the associate of man, and gains every day a greater influence in the social order: how the causes that have hitherto determined her subordination, being one by one weakened, must at last disappear; and how with them will disappear that predominance, that guardianship, that eternal minority which is still imposed on women, and which would be incompatible with the future social state that we foresee."

These opinions about the position of women, were misconstrued by the public to mean, that women should cease to be tied to their own households and husbands,

and should be left to the same, or to more liberty, than even men assume. The same misapprehension existed with regard to property. It was thought that under this anticipated reign of love, private possessions were to cease, and community of goods was to be established. As we have already seen, this was far from the truth ; since every man was to have an income varying according to his capacity and his works. The real change proposed was that inheritance should cease, that a man at his death should not be at liberty to indicate his heirs, that his family should not receive the property he left, but that everything should devolve on the State, which would thus obtain the means of rewarding every man in proportion to his ability and industry.

These misapprehensions as to the doctrines of the sect, prevailed amongst Parisians of the highest distinction as thinkers, down to 1830, five years after St. Simon's death : and this might astonish us, if we did not meet with abundant examples among ourselves, of ignorance as to what is going on around us. Our leading politicians would give but lame answers to an examination paper, requiring an explanation of the peculiar views of Irving and Dr. Cumming. We ought not then, to wonder at finding that after the revolution of 1830, the sect was the subject of misrepresentation in the Chamber of Deputies. The *Doctrine* has a letter addressed to the President of the Chamber of Deputies, in reply to some of the members ; and I will give a few extracts.

"Paris, le 1er Octobre, 1830.*

"MONSIEUR LE PRÉSIDENT,—In the sitting of the Chamber of 29th September, M. Mauguin, speaking of popular societies, remarked upon the existence of a sect half-religious, half-philosophical, professing ideas as to property that were peculiar to it: at these words many members of the assembly named the St. Simonian society; and the orator continuing to explain his opinion of this society, though speaking of it in other respects in a kindly tone, represented it as inculcating a community of goods.

"In the next day's sitting, M. Dupin, speaking of the same society, repeated the assertion of his colleague, adding that the St. Simonians aimed at another community, which he did not explain: and some voices around him crying out that it was that of women, he did not contradict this interpretation put upon his words.

"Here then, are the St. Simonians pointed out to France and the whole of Europe, as desiring a community of property, and according to an expression which it is impossible to repeat without repugnance, a community of women.

"Innovators no doubt, must expect to see their lessons misrepresented, their doctrines caricatured; such is, on their first presentation, the inevitable condition of their situation, and in most cases, they ought to accept this

* This date is about two months after the "three days" at the end of July, which effected the revolution.

trial with resignation, leaving it to their future efforts to correct errors, and to repair the injustice that they suffer for the moment.

"Yes, no doubt, the St. Simonians profess as to the future of property and as to the future of women, ideas which are peculiar to them, and which are connected with particular and new ideas on religion, on power, on liberty; in a word, on all those great problems which are being discussed throughout Europe in so violent and disorderly a manner. But the ideas attributed to them are far from being the true ones.

"The St. Simonians refuse this equal distribution of goods, which would constitute in their eyes a greater violence, a more revolting injustice, than the unequal partition which was originally effected by force of arms and conquest, for they believe in natural inequality and regard it as the very basis of association, as the indispensable condition of social order.

"Christianity has freed women from slavery, but it has condemned them to inferiority; and throughout Christian Europe we find them still stricken with religious, political, and civil interdiction.

"The St. Simonians have appeared in order to announce their definitive enfranchisement, their complete emancipation, but without intending to abolish the holy marriage law proclaimed by Christianity: on the contrary they come to accomplish this law, to give it a new sanction, to add to the power and inviolability of the union which it consecrates.

"They require, like Christians, that one man should

be united to one woman, but they teach that the wife should be the equal of the husband."

These quotations, together with the explanations that preceded them, may be sufficient to indicate the new organization of society which was proposed. The system is very vaguely expressed both by its author and by his disciples. In this respect it differs remarkably from that of Fourier; who, as we shall see in the next chapter, maps out the whole world, as the theatre of his operations, into states and provinces and districts and phalansteres; prescribing to each section its form, number of inmates, and specific duties. The New Christianity was the work of an elderly French gentleman, whose previous labours had attracted little attention; and it was carried into effect by beardless youths, or wild speculators, to whom experience had not revealed the truth, that in practical matters, details are every whit as important as principles.

A selection from the titles of the published works of the St. Simonians, shall close this section. It will perhaps stimulate curiosity to know something of the career of the sect after 1830 or 1831, the date of the *Doctrine*. We have,

A Synoptical Table of the St. Simonian Religion.

Political Economy and Politics by *Enfantin*.

General Réunion of the Family, with a Note on Marriage and Divorce.

Letters of the Father on Eternal Life.

The Priest, the Man, and the Woman.

Means of forthwith Abolishing all taxes on Drinks, on Salt, &c.

Enfranchisement of Women.

Preaching of 2nd December. Address after the preaching.

Reports to the Supreme Fathers on the Situation and Labours of the Family.

General Communion of the St. Simonian Family.

Religious Thoughts by a St. Simonian.

Proceedings before the Correctional Police; with Portraits of MM. Enfantin and Henry Fournel.

Is it a Legal Proceeding by which the Government has suspended the exercise of St. Simonian worship?

SECTION IV.—The joint Pontiffs—Their character—Political revolution of 1830—Publication of St. Simonianism—The *Globe* journal becomes its organ—Rapid success in Paris and in the departments—The *Globe*, how conducted—Poetry, eloquence, philosophy—Ambition of M. Enfantin—Retirement and death of M. Bayard.

It appears from the two last of the titles of books given above, that the sect after a time came into collision with the judicial authorities of Paris. I propose in this section to relate, after M. Louis Reybaud, what was the series of events that led to this unpleasing consummation, and what proceedings were afterwards adopted. I have already stated that the sect became so far corrupted as to disclaim the protests I have quoted, with regard to the relation of women to their husbands.

Little has been said at present, about the persons who assumed the supreme direction of affairs after St. Simon's death. The oldest, and most direct disciple, was M. Olinde Rodrigues: but the new law allowed no such consideration as this to determine an election; it rejected inheritance and priority of claim; it saluted, or recognised, or *acclaimed* (to use the adopted term) capacity and nothing else. On this ground, MM. Enfantin and Bazard assumed the position of joint pontiffs, as being the most sympathetic and capable of the members: and the sect recognized their claims and accepted them as leaders. In truth they had worked hard and long, were devoted to the new doctrine, and possessed great abilities: no one of the disciples could sustain a comparison with them. Much discussion took place at the time, as to the characteristics of these two gentlemen: and one thing was evident, that their tastes and powers were of so different a quality, as to make it improbable that they should long act in concert. M. Bazard was an old politician, had been a political exile, and in spite of his new professions, still retained an involuntary interest in the revolutionary cause for which he had suffered. He could not refrain from occasionally regarding his adopted doctrine from a worldly point of view, unable altogether to discard his old love of praise and fear of sarcasm. He was a keen logician, an indefatigable thinker, an unusually able *populariser*, and never failed fully to develope whatever theme he took in hand. He had an amiable and caressing manner, and knew when

to exert himself, when to retire from the field. M. Enfantin was a man of a quite different stamp. He had never meddled with politics, and had therefore no personal recollections to excite his sympathy or his anger; the most striking movements of the state possessed no interest for him; unmoved amidst the storms of the world, he was bent only on enlisting disciples; he saw every thing from a St. Simonian point of view. His brain might be regarded as a mine, from which he was constantly extracting the ore of new schemes, which he handed over to the laboratory of M. Bazard to be refined and polished. The one pontiff was a discoverer, the other a manipulator: M. Enfantin invented, M. Bazard gave form and finish.

One of these leaders might have adopted the motto of *Forward*, the other of *Festina lente*; for they represented the two tendencies which are found in most successful undertakings. In politics, a country is unsafe if it does not contain a strong development of both the progressive and the conservative principle. In a private business, a young man is useful in striking out new schemes, an elderly man in modifying and restraining the too hasty growth of mushroom projects. But without some necessity for union, it is difficult for the representatives of the two principles to continue to act together: for the enthusiast fumes at the restraint put upon him, the apathetic elder wearies of always tugging at the reins. In politics, the progressive and the conservative parties are not required to act together confidentially, and a common patriotism keeps them within

the bounds of moderation: in private concerns, the younger man is commonly subordinated by the power of the purse; and by the time he has accumulated the means of going alone, the prudence of age has come upon him, and it is his turn to use the bridle instead of the spur.

MM. Enfantin and Bazard however, started under the most agreeable auspices; both being equally devoted to the new philosophy: and it was only later in the day, when a certain amount of success had inflated the vain expectations of the more forward, that the incompatibility of temperament became apparent. At present they agreed in forming the college, into which were admitted the disciples of the first and second epochs; the conductors of the *Producteur* and of the *Organisateur*. Afterwards the head-quarters of the sect were transferred to the Rue Monsigny, where some months later a St. Simonian family was formed.

This took place on the eve of the July Revolution of 1830. When victory had legitimized freedom of thought and of placards, the sect seized the opportunity of publicity. A startling manifesto, signed in Siamese fashion, "Bazard—Enfantin," was posted on the walls of Paris, side by side with a proclamation of Lafayette and an appeal to the Orleans family. The people laughed, but the Chamber of Deputies regarded the matter more gravely, anxious no doubt to avoid any unnecessary complications at a period of so much delicacy and difficulty; when the removal of legitimate authority opened the vista of anarchy, startling those

men who could almost remember, or who had gathered from their fathers, the September massacres, the drownings, and the perpetual rumble of the condemned tumbril on its way to the guillotine. How would our fathers have felt in 1688, if there had started from the ashes of the Commonwealth, a strange sect half-religious, half-philosophical, proposing to remodel society, and desirous of establishing a new hierarchy utterly at variance with the king, lords, and commons of tradition? It was on this occasion that was written that letter to the President of the Chamber of Deputies, from which I have already quoted, as containing a distinct and indignant disavowal of the alleged doctrines of community of goods and community of wives.

M. Reybaud quotes a large part of this letter, and says of it that it is sufficiently explicit, and is the most clear and precise document that the sect has left us; having the higher value, as exhibiting the exact pretensions put forth at this time.

The St. Simonian Church was now formed, and enjoyed a certain degree of prosperity. Some donations were made, after the example of the members of the college: and as it is stated, the property was thrown into a common fund; though after the distinct renunciation of communism that I have quoted, this inconsistency requires an explanation that I have not seen offered. It was thought advisable that the Church should again have a journal of its own; and the *Globe* having been offered, was bought on the 31st January 1831, after which date it appeared with the addition of

the words "Journal of the Doctrine of St. Simon," and with the heading,

"Religion.

"Science.

Industry.

"UNIVERSAL ASSOCIATION.

"All social institutions ought to aim at the amelioration, moral, intellectual, and physical, of the greatest and poorest class.

"All the privileges of birth, without exception, are abolished.

"To every man according to his capacity, to every capacity according to its works."

A rapid proselytism, we are told, now took place. There was a rush of men of restless and inquisitive temperaments, of dreamers and of enthusiasts, towards the new sect, and it was joined by philosophers, artists, and industrials. Many persons of some distinction in France, became members: but the sect sustained a loss by the death of M. Eugene Rodrigues, an enthusiastic neophyte, who had just given proofs of great talent in his *Letters to Burns on politics and religion*. The college being too small to admit the enlarged numbers, two preparatory and subordinate colleges were formed as feeders for the principal one. This success was followed by the constituting a family, which was installed in the Rue Monsigny; and this was the means of introducing the association among the *bourgeois*.

Out of doors the sect attracted much attention, and not without great scandal. The apostles of the creed had adopted various ways of making themselves heard:

preachings, missions, pamphlets, daily controversy: anything to help the propaganda. Under the direction of MM. Hippolyte Carnot, and Dugied, instruction was given at four different points: the sermons, instead of being weekly, were preached every day; they were adapted to the capacities of the audience, being popular and simple for workmen, poetical and animated for artists, severe and exact for savans. Centres of action had been chosen in the twelve *arrondissements* of Paris: and finally five churches had been affiliated in the departments; at Toulouse, Montpellier, Lyons, Metz, and Dijon.

In Paris, the *Globe* newspaper was much read. It was not conducted exclusively as an organ of the sect, but treated of the questions of the day; and M. Enfantin particularly, in essays on political economy, condescended to propose certain reforms in the actual organization of society. He laid down this principle: "Society is composed of idlers and labourers; a policy ought to aim at the amelioration, moral, physical, and intellectual, of the labourers, and at the gradual extinction of the idlers. The means of accomplishing these ends are, as to the idlers, the abolition of all the privileges of birth, and as to the labourers their classification according to their capacities, and their remuneration according to their works." This no doubt, is the formula of the sect; but M. Enfantin consented to modify the application of it for a time. Among other things, instead of demanding the immediate abolition of inheritance, he proposed that collateral succession should

be abolished: that the sons and daughters should divide the possessions of their deceased parent, but that in default of such direct heirs the property should devolve to the state. He pointed out the evils of collateral successions, and especially those of remote degrees; their multiplied partitions of land, their vexatious law-suits: and he suggested that such properties might be advantageously employed in the reduction of taxation; contending that the interest of the many should be preferred to that of a few distant relatives, unknown perhaps to the deceased, objects of entire indifference to him, or possibly even his enemies. Such successions too often add to the excessive fortune of a few idlers, and would be far better employed in lightening the burdens of the industrious masses.

Besides this, M. Enfantin was in favour of a heavy tax on direct successions, as a means of furnishing part of the revenue of the state. This tax should become still heavier as the heirs were further of kin from the deceased: and this mode might by many persons be preferred to an actual seizure of an estate in default of direct heirs; as removing the necessity of intrusting the management of the property to the hands of incapable public servants. This tax, even on direct succession, was defended on the ground that it was taken at the time the property changed hands, and when, in many cases, it was about to devolve on those who would unfortunately be perverted by it, from industrials into idlers.

The question as to the advantages of this tax on

successions, is one that has been much debated in England. On the one hand it has been contended, with M. Enfantin, that at the time when property changes hands, a diminution of it is little felt; and that the seizure of a portion of it thus differs entirely from the confiscation of part of an estate of a living man. A merchant dies in India, leaving 100 lacs of rupees to be sent home for his surviving nephews and nieces. These heirs knew that they had a rich uncle who had occasionally sent them some shawls or gold mohurs, but of the amount of whose treasures they had no definite conceptions. Suppose the Government took 20 lacs for probate and legacy duty, leaving only 80 instead of 100 lacs to be distributed: what matters it that this man, an industrious grocer, gets only 80,000*l.* instead of 100,000*l.*; or that that young woman married to a country clergyman, comes into possession of 40,000*l.* instead of 50,000*l.*? Would not the 30,000*l.* be far better applied to the public service than to swelling the upstart vanity of these unfortunate heirs?

The answer is obvious: such cases of enormous wealth are so rare as to be unworthy of attention: they could only be reached by laws which should deal with persons' fortunes in proportion to their magnitude; a kind of legislation distasteful to our notions of justice. The majority of estates are small, and descend to the widow and children of the deceased. In such cases it cannot be alleged that the heirs are turned from the pursuits of industry to lives of idleness: for it more often happens that they are reduced from comparative

affluence to poverty ; the death of the head of the house annihilating the income derived from his exertions. The funeral expenses, and the necessary legal charges, are considerable ; and it is often felt to be a great hardship that Government should step in at such a season of distress, to seize by probate and legacy duty a share of the slender portion of the widow or the orphan ; acting like wreckers on the coast, who prey on the destitution of the afflicted. It cannot be disputed that the legacy and probate duties do in many cases inflict a real hardship ; and the only mitigation practicable seems to be the mode adopted in England, of levying a graduated tax, making it a very low one in the case of inheritance by children, and increasing it according to the remoteness of kindred of the heirs. These taxes themselves can be defended only on the ground that all imposts are evils, that a public revenue must be found, and that this branch of income cannot be spared without great inconvenience. State necessity is not always the tyrant's plea.

Another objection however, has been raised, on severe considerations of political economy. This tax it is said falls on capital, whereas all taxes should be levied on income. According to the orthodox school, capital is the foundation of social opulence ; an affluence of capital is necessary to national progress ; capital cannot be in excess, and therefore to increase it should be the aim of every statesman. I fully assent to the truth of the two first of these propositions, but I demur to the last as unsound when applied to England. We have generally

in this country as much capital as we need, and indeed very often, such a superabundance of it, as to make us the laughing stock of the world, for the foolish adventures into which our merchants are driven by the plethora of their purses. Our Government may safely leave our propensities to accumulation to take care of themselves, and may levy a revenue wherever they can do so without inflicting any needless individual hardship. Louis Blanc would of course, go much further. Regarding capitalists as the modern ogres who grind the bones of the industrious to make their bread, he would be delighted to see the public revenue raised by constantly slicing off a portion of the stock of traders of every description; he would, no doubt, abolish all imposts on articles consumed by the working classes, and levy all taxation on realised property, with no thought about capitalists but to harass and crush them as the natural enemies of mankind. It would be a great injustice, however, to attribute such sentiments to the St. Simonians. Their desire was to protect property, but abolish inheritance: to allow the wife and family to share the possessions of the husband and father during his lifetime, but to filch those possessions at his decease, as the property of the State, leaving the widow and her young ones to work or starve. So much for St. Simon's law of love!

M. Enfantin, however, in recommending the suppression of only collateral successions, did not lay himself open to the charge of infringing on the rights of widows and children deprived of their natural protector: and

he might with a calm conscience enlarge on the many advantageous possible applications of the fund to be raised by his proposed measure; on the abolition of the salt-tax, of lotteries, of indirect taxes; or on the establishment of public schools, on the improvement of roads, the embellishment of towns, the promotion of an amended agriculture. In other branches of political economy, M. Enfantin seems to have done good service; by supporting beneficial measures as to the sinking fund, loans, the national debt, taxation generally; subjects that in the early part of the reign of Louis Philippe, appear to have been warmly debated. The articles of the *Globe* were not mere essays on the abstract questions, but they descended to facts and figures. They warmly supported the mobilization of property, and the increase of banks, which institutions M. Enfantin regarded not as mere money-brokers, but as industrial companies, whose business it was to distribute the means of production among the persons best fitted to use them profitably.

M. Enfantin was well supported by his coadjutors. MM. Stéphane Mony and Emile Péreire were afterwards concerned in the formation of the railroad from St. Germain to Paris, the first French railroad of any importance. In 1831 they took an important part in the *Globe*, M. Mony exhibiting, as we are told, something of the practical ability and clear good sense of the illustrious Franklin; while M. Péreire devoted himself more particularly to statistics, which he endeavoured to redeem from the false uses and

fallacious conclusions by which they had been disfigured.

Several distinguished disciples, says M. Reybaud, employed their pens on poetry, eloquence, and philosophy. M. Barrault imitated the pompous allegorical style of the East. M. Michel Chevalier allured the world with sonorous periods, in which he foretold golden harvests, delicious fruits, a smiling population, canals and railroads, an extended commerce, such greatness and pleasure and harmony, that the coldest were intoxicated with these marvellous dreams, and surrendered themselves to the enchanting influence of tales worthy of the Thousand and One Nights. At the same time, MM. Leroux, Jean Reynaud, and Charles Duveyrier, addressed themselves to metaphysical subjects, and leaving the old and beaten track, furnished their readers with the St. Simonian views of God and man, of the laws of belief, of mankind and its history, of its indefinite perfectibility and slow progress. M. Louis Reybaud, himself no St. Simonian, writing of these things while still young, spoke of them as noble labours even though they bore little fruit and received scanty reward: but at a later date, when years had chilled his enthusiasm, he bestowed on them a more hesitating and doubtful eulogy.

The period just described was the most prosperous one of the sect. The St. Simonians had overcome the difficulties which had beset their master, and which had clouded their own early efforts; they had emerged from poverty and difficulties; they had gathered around

them many men of great ability and of high attainments; they had found the means of bringing their strange reveries fully before the world; they had addressed themselves with success to all classes of society; they had organized a church, a hierarchy, and a family, on their own models; and they had established a journal in support of their peculiar views. But from the first there existed among them a germ of difficulty, which the prosperity they now enjoyed warmed into life. The differences of temper and sentiment that I have already pointed out as distinguishing MM. Bazard and Enfantin, had been suppressed for a time but had not been rooted out.

M. Bazard knew by experience, the difficulties of contending with the world. He had unwillingly consented that the sect should become a church instead of a school; and he was desirous of holding back from action until a large number of people were impressed with the truth of the doctrine. M. Enfantin could not consent to this slow and precarious course, but was all for immediate action. M. Bazard desired to convince the reason, M. Enfantin desired to surprise the heart of his hearers: the one wanted pupils, the other wanted disciples. M. Enfantin looked with contempt on their little family, and was ambitious of embracing the whole world as his followers; his day-dreams were of universal supremacy, of a political and religious royalty: and when he found that his coadjutor was only a drag on his movements, he determined to get rid of him and to reign alone. If, as is supposed, he

sincerely hoped to revolutionize the world, he might be jealous of a rival near the throne, or rather of a joint monarch. Nothing could be easier than to accomplish his project. The two pontiffs reigned only by the will of their subjects: they had no force at their command; no property of their own as a means of corruption. In popular movements, the most forward and hardy leader is commonly the most successful; for he appeals to the enthusiasm of men: while the prudent and cautious leader who addresses himself to the reason, finds his voice lost in the clamour of the crowd. It is one of the many curses of demagogues at all times, that they are ever on the point of being out-bid by any quack with a louder voice and a greater stock of impudence. M. Bazard seems to have proved unequal to this contest. He retired from the Church unwillingly, and in a few months more was in his grave.

SECTION V—Change of management—Occasion of schism—Enfranchisement of prolétaires and of women—A female Messiah invoked—Series of fêtes—Treasury exhausted—Appeal to money—Loan—Secession of M. Rodrigues—Retirement of sect to Mémil-montant—Parti-coloured life—Strange exposition—A philosophical epic—Criminal proceedings against the sect—Dispersion.

Hitherto the sect had been managed with considerable wisdom. Wild as were the doctrines professed and the hopes entertained, the boldness of innovators had been

tempered by prudence. But in allowing M. Enfantin to eject his coadjutor, the St. Simonians had thoughtlessly deprived themselves of the conservative element necessary to permanent success: and henceforth they were liable to be carried away by the passionate enthusiasm of their remaining leader, without any rudder to guide them, or any break to restrain their onward career.

It is not to be understood however, that M. Bazard was deserted by his friends. On the contrary, when the disruption between the two leaders took place, some of the members adhered to one of them, some to the other. The two hostile camps met each other twice; once on the 19th and once on the 21st of November 1831; but M. Bazard refused to be present, and retiring with a confession of defeat, died soon afterwards, as I have already said.

The occasion of this schism was a difference of opinion on two important subjects: the enfranchisement of the prolétaire, and the enfranchisement of woman. For the sake of some readers who may have seen this word prolétaire, without clearly apprehending its meaning, I will explain what I understand by it. The Dictionary of the Academy gives as the primary sense of prolétaires;—"Those who in Rome constituted the sixth and lowest class of the people, and who being very poor were exempt from taxes and from the liability to serve in war. The term is used in a modern sense to signify those who have no competent means of living. Some writers appear to extend the meaning still further

to all who having no income from property, depend on the labour of their hands for their daily bread."

To enfranchise the prolétaires, would in England seem reasonable enough, because all classes of society in this country are in fact at liberty to act as they please, so long as they infringe on no individual rights. Our lowest classes may go where they choose, work for whom they choose, meet together in any way and in any numbers that may seem good to them, combine to raise wages, strike work at any time, and do this by concerted action throughout the whole kingdom at a given moment. They are free even to license. But in France it is far otherwise. In that troubled country it has been thought necessary to subject the working classes to many restraints. It is inevitable that in France, to which we may apply the expression used by Bossuet of the England of his day, "a country more stormy than the waves which beat upon its shores;" it is inevitable that combinations and affiliated societies, should be repressed and punished with unsparing severity. But there is a law with regard to individual workmen which seems to us singularly harsh, and quite inconsistent with that liberty which is constantly in the mouths of our neighbours, but finds small utterance in their laws.

I quote from M. Emile de Girardin, the late editor of the *Presse*; a gentleman of unquestioned authority as to facts, however he may share with other distinguished men in the wild desire for revolutionising the moral laws of society. In the notes on the Third Book of

La Politique Universelle, occurs the following statement. "Before the revolution of 1848, and according to the tenor of the ordonnance of 2nd January 1849, a French workman having once entered a manufactory, could not quit it without a written dismissal: he was nearly as much attached to his trade as a labourer to the soil. The laws of 17th March and 17th June 1791, which decreed freedom of industry, emancipated the workman from this restriction. It was not till 1803 that the law of 22nd Germinal subjected the workmen to the *livret*. The scarcity of men at this time led the masters to entice them from each other. The law of 22nd Germinal invented the *livret* as a record of the workman's engagements.

"In 1845, the Government proposed to the Chamber of Peers, a new law on the *livrets*. The Peers discussed the proposition at length, and modified it considerably. It did not reach the Chamber of Deputies till February 1847, and the report on it was not made till the close of the session. This delay, followed by the revolution of 1848, prevented anything from being done: and it was not till 1854 that the legislature passed a law, which was to come into operation on 1st January 1855."

I give a few of the leading provisions of the law of 1854.

1. Workpeople of either sex attached to manufactures, mills, &c., or working at home for one or more masters, must furnish themselves with a book.
2. These books can be obtained from the mayor or other authorities named, and will not be charged more

than 2½d. 3. Masters are forbidden to employ anyone unprovided with a legal book. 4. The employer is bound to enter on the book, and on a register kept by himself, the surname and Christian name of the workman, and other particulars. When the workman leaves, the fact is to be inscribed, together with the amount of any debt owing to the employer. The 8th clause provides that the employer shall not make the book a means of giving a character, as he is prohibited from stating anything, favourable or unfavourable, as to the workman's conduct. By clause 9, this book, being properly *visé*, serves as a passport. Other clauses provide for the punishment of persons who neglect the former provisions, who obtain false books, or who are guilty of other frauds.

We hear in this country many remarks condemnatory of the law of settlement, as interfering with the due circulation of labour and with the freedom of industry: but we should be stunned by the objurgations of editors and philanthropists if we adopted the French law. We should hear of hindrances thrown by masters in the way of workmen desiring to leave them; of time lost by men in getting the necessary entries; of the circulation of labour impeded, of the productiveness of labour diminished.

We may judge from the foregoing clauses passed in 1854, what kind of law that was which was enacted originally in 1849; when the labourers of France, though not serfs, were as to condition and treatment worse than serfs: and which was renewed in 1803,

when men tired of anarchy, submitted languidly to the dictates of a military despot. No wonder that M. Enfantin lent his influence in the *Globe*, to the enfranchisement of the labourer from such severe restrictions. Such a course would meet the approval of all liberal and benevolent men: but unfortunately, the enfranchisement was contrary to Article 291 of the Penal Code: and M. Bazard, who was warned by previous experience, hesitated to disobey the law; fearing the probable interference of the executive, which at that time had been a good deal harassed by popular societies.

The proposed enfranchisement of women, it is alleged, was personally distasteful to M. Bazard: and when we see to what lengths his brother Pontiff was desirous of proceeding, our sympathies will be entirely with M. Bazard. In the first of the two meetings of which I have spoken, M. Enfantin, after explaining the cause of the schism, stated his views on the delicate question of the rights of women. He declared that women ought to be invited to the priesthood on equal terms with men: he laid down with great solemnity the principle, that St. Simonianism, having opposed itself in its gospel to the exploitation of one man by another, ought also to condemn with equal force, the exploitation of woman by man. Christianity, he said, had emancipated woman, but had condemned her to subordination. St. Simonianism was to set her altogether free and to treat her as the equal of man. M. Reybaud furnishes us with some further remarks made by M. Enfantin; remarks of a not very edifying nature, and better

adapted perhaps, to the moral atmosphere of Paris than to that of England. M. Bazard, as we have seen, was not present; but another disciple, M. Pierre Leroux, who was subsequently an advocate of some distinction, and better known as the head of a strange sect of *Humanitarians*, interfered warmly, telling M. Enfantin, "You are now propounding a doctrine that the college has unanimously rejected; I am here to-day to tell you so, and I shall now retire." M. Enfantin replied, addressing himself to his church, and pointing to M. Leroux: "The evidence of the truth of my assertions is before you. There is the man who is the best representative of virtue as it has hitherto been conceived; and you are witnesses that this man's virtue cannot understand the universality of my words." Was M. Enfantin a hypocrite or a self-deceiver?

The discussion thus begun in the first meeting, proceeded to angry and bitter words; and at last MM. Leroux, Reynaud (not Reybaud, my authority) Cazeaux, Péréire, and other dissentients, retired. In the second meeting no discussion was allowed. M. Enfantin after using some coarse expressions about the schismatics, addressed his faithful church; and pointing to M. Bazard's empty chair, addressed it as the symbol of his appeal to woman. It will be remembered that M. Olinde Rodrigues was one of the earliest of St. Simon's disciples. He, at this crisis, adhered to M. Enfantin: at the second meeting he spoke after his pontiff; he declared that a change had taken place in the hierarchy; that M. Enfantin was the most moral man of his generation: that he was

the true successor of St. Simon, and the supreme head of the new sect; then with the same gravity, he announced himself as the father of the industrial branch, and of public worship. We are disposed to wonder how the two augurs could meet without laughing in each other's faces. M. Rodrigues also made some mystical observations about money, to which base substance he made an appeal, desiring as he said, to inaugurate its moral power.

The religion itself underwent a change. Dogmas, the favourite subject of M. Bazard, were set aside with their master, and the sect devoted itself to questions of worship and morality; action taking the place of speculation. The flesh, as distinguished from the spirit, was solemnly reinstated in its rights. Epicurus beat Zeno out of the field. Sanctification was pronounced over labour, over the pleasures of the table, over all the sensual gratifications, and this in no very measured terms. An appeal was again made to woman, and it was anticipated that she would appear to furnish the sect with a code of delicacy and modesty. The expectation of a female Messiah was long the dream of this last period of the sect. Without her no progress could be made; daily was she invoked, everywhere was she looked for: wanting her, the sacerdotal couple remained incomplete, and the sect halted in its gait. To accomplish this new manifestation, resort was had to every means calculated to act on the imagination and the senses. The winter of 1832 in the Rue Monsigny was a long fete, in which the sect crowned itself with

roses, exhilarated itself with punch and lively music, and invited all Paris to share its enjoyments. Among the visitors were some women, elegant, young, graceful, and handsome, who, after a worldly fashion, danced and flirted, without a thought of the religious meaning concealed beneath these follies. The resources of St. Simonism were exhausted, but no female Messiah was revealed.

To sustain these expenses, to pay for the balls and music and suppers, and to sustain the dignity of the sect, large funds were required. Besides, the *Globe* was distributed gratis, and this swallowed up a large annual income: and to make matters worse, the schism had cut off, by the reduction of the leading members, an important source of income. After the remaining disciples had by degrees devoted all their means to the church, the treasury was found almost empty, and the common property was not easily available. On the 31st July 1831, the balance-sheet showed that the assets and liabilities were about equal, except that some real property remained untouched.

To restore the finances, M. Olinde Rodrigues imagined his appeal to money and its possessors; and some of his words are worthy of quotation. "Rothschild, Aguado, Lafitte, have undertaken no enterprise so grand as the one I propose. They have all appeared at the close of war to furnish the vanquished with the means of appeasing their conquerors. Their mission is at an end, and mine begins. The exchanges of Paris, London, and Berlin, must lend on the security of the political

and financial future of the association of labourers. I undertake to lay the foundation of St. Simonian credit." Strange wild words, but backed by a commencement of action, enough to show the sincerity, and to magnify the imbecility of M. Rodrigues. Legal measures were actually adopted to establish a collective society, under the title of Benjamin Olinde Rodrigues and Co., under the authorization and with the assistance of M. Enfantin. There were issued shares and coupons of the nominal amount of 40*l.*, with 10*l.* paid up, giving a right to a dividend of 2*l.* a year. M. Rodrigues did not succeed in creating a new Messiah scheme: he was no successful rival of Law. Capitalists looked shyly at this novel paper, and refused to embark their property in a company which had no visible means of producing an income, and which had but little real property to fall back upon if the proposed adventure proved a failure. The Bourse was hard-hearted and refused its assistance. A few shares were taken by persons interested in the sect; but what was thus gained was more than lost by this appeal to the pocket, and by the shadow of venality cast over what had hitherto been an object of disinterested attachment.

The organization of labour was also unfortunate. M. Stephane Morry, who would have rendered it successful if such a consummation had been possible, had continued faithful to M. Enfantin, more, it is said, from personal affection than from conviction. It appears that no less than four thousand workmen had been admitted into the church, and were employed in different trades

by the sect, which had thus become a great commercial company. The undertaking was unprofitable. The workmen, secure of their maintenance, showed little alacrity in their occupations; and there occurred many disputes which were not settled without the intervention of the hierarchy. The difficulty was not to increase the numbers of the sect, but to employ them advantageously. The workmen of good character and of superior skill, would generally hesitate to leave established masters on whom they could rely, in order to join an undertaking which might be abandoned at any moment; and with careless, unskilful men, no manufactory can be profitably conducted. Workmen had in some instances offered themselves, not from absolute want of employment, but because the church promised an increased remuneration; and the paying higher wages would make profitable competition in the market impossible. These promises therefore could not long be kept; and then must follow complaints, recrimination, and desertion by all who were not so entirely helpless as to have no value as workmen. It would have been amusing and instructive to hear what were the remarks made by the workmen themselves, on this insane project. M. Morny, working afterwards with the ordinary machinery of society, employing men on wages, and paying the market price according to the work done, must have often looked back with amusement at once and disgust, on the days when he had to play at the game of workmen and master, with the unpleasant drawback of hungry bellies to be filled.

But to these misfortunes was added an interference on the part of Louis Philippe's Government. In the midst of the reconciliations and confessions of the faithful after M. Bazard's departure, when M. Enfantin and his assistants had carefully exhibited impromptu scenes invented at leisure, the Church was expelled from its temple by a domiciliary visit of the police. In the Rue de Monsigny too, the papers were seized and used as a basis of criminal proceedings.

As a climax of ill-luck, a dissension had sprung up between M. Enfantin and M. Olinde Rodrigues. It was caused by a further discussion of one of the topics which had led to M. Bazard's retirement. Either at that time M. Rodrigues had misunderstood his pontiff's meaning in his appeal to woman, or since that time M. Enfantin had been encouraged by success and impunity to give a further development to his doctrine. M. Rodrigues now accused his leader of aiming at a community of women, under the guise of religion: he said, "I have affirmed that in the St. Simonian family, every child ought to recognize his father. M. Enfantin expressed a desire that the woman alone should be called upon for an opinion as to this grave question." I suppose we are to understand by this, that in the opinion of M. Enfantin, the question of husband and wife and their relation to each other, would be better deferred until the advent of the female Messiah: but that M. Rodrigues would tolerate no delay or compromise on so fundamental a matter. The suddenness of the rupture, and its inopportuneness on the eve of

a Government prosecution, failed to attract any great attention to the departure of M. Rodrigues.

This loss brought others in its train. The dissentient leader had had the duty of raising the required loan; he had used his own name in his efforts to negotiate it; and his retirement destroyed the little credit it enjoyed. About 3,000*l.* or 3,500*l.*, had been paid up; and instead of disposing of further shares, the Church had to pay some of the coupons to holders who would accept no excuses. The *Globe* expired for want of funds; the workshops were closed; at last, the family of the Rue Monsigny was dissolved. Another phase of the sect now took place.

M. Enfantin possessed at Ménilmontant, on a headland of the coast, a patrimonial property consisting of a very large house with a handsome garden attached. He determined to use this as a last asylum for his strange family. There he might await in contemplative leisure, the tardy manifestation of the female Messiah: might practice association on a small scale, until the hour arrived for an universal and laborious association. His proposed organization was in direct opposition to his constant sermons against the idle. His object here was to abolish domestic life; to accustom his disciples, even the proudest of them, to the duties of prolétaires; to discipline almost to a conventual life, forty young men; to ascertain if they would hold out to the end, and bear the hootings of the crowd as they had already borne the satire of the wits. M. Enfantin condescended to explain himself with clearness, in a

document addressed, *To all*. He desired, he said, to call woman and the prolétaire to a new destiny. He went on to explain how his word, sown ⁱⁿ Paris, would continue its mysterious work, and how there would in a short time, be no politics but the charter of the future that he had founded.

Ménilmontant then, beheld its forty youths; who immured themselves in their garden, devoted themselves to the task of labourers, pruned the trees, dug and raked, sowed and watered, and by turns filled the offices of cook, butler, and cupbearer. They performed their more laborious tasks in gangs, lightening their toils by singing hymns, the compositions of one of their number. Afterwards, when the public was occasionally admitted, people were treated to concerts of this family music: then as a distinguished favour, they were admitted to see the Father dine with something of royal state. The forty disciples, far from being confined to monkish austerity in dress, wore a neat uniform, with their hair and beard carefully arranged in oriental fashion. Many other proceedings wore a theatrical air. The costume was inaugurated to the sound of cannon, police were seen with crossed bayonets, harangues were made in the open air, synods were held on the green, a thousand follies were committed, with the intention of cajoling the public, but to me seem fitted only to make fools smile, and judicious men grieve.

The interior life of these parti-coloured recluses was an object of curiosity, which, as M. Reybaud tells us, was not gratified by any publication. A manuscript

however, is quoted, which gives us a sketch of the notions that prevailed in this half-monkish, half-frivolous house. In a first sitting at Ménilmontant, M. Enfantin seated himself, with M. Michel Chevalier and others on either side of him. The language put in the mouth of M. Enfantin is of the obscurest in the original, and is not likely to become clearer by my translation. He referred to the two groups, one on each side of him, and saw in these groups and this order, a living fact, a catechism opened in two leaves, each divided into two columns; on one side M.M. Fournel and Barrault; on the other MM. Michel and Charles. "In the first, the initiation into life is translated into a verb. It is a formula and a language, it is algebraic precision and rhymed text, it is cypher and letter, metaphysics, poetry, grammar, and prosody. . . . This leaf is conceived under an inspiration like that which presided over the Christian catechism; it is the conception of the word, with however, the conquest of algebra; it is Plato developed through Descartes and Leibnitz."

"This leaf is the scientific encyclopædia.

"It is the abstract and concrete formula of life.

"In the other leaf instruction is produced by a form and a picture. It is the geometric diagram, the plan, the sketch, the image animated, coloured, lively, which is fitted to strike the sensuous man, the active, practical man, the theurgian, the artisan of worship."

"This leaf is the Egyptian hieroglyphic, but enriched with movement and colour."

"It is the new industrial and æsthetical encyclopædia."

"It is the composite form of life, as the other leaf was the abstract and concrete form."

From this definition of the living catechism, the *New Book* passes on to the elements which constitute general science; and it finds that science in the *formula* and *form* which Descartes had already combined in his application of geometry to algebra; to which by adding morals, there is found the new trinitarian dogma, composed of *sentiment*, *formula*, and *form*. It would be tiresome to translate all the other quotations given by M. Reybaud; but I will give a few more to complete this picture of science run mad. Algebra, æsthetics, the infinitesimal theory of Leibnitz, all are lugged in to supply unintelligible additions to this strange rant.

"God, whom the revolutionary mathematicians vainly drove out of their sanctuary, and who however, always remained there manifest or concealed, under the name of the infinite, or under the deceptive veil of limits;—God will reappear there more glorious than ever, to animate all our conceptions. Then the word, supreme and infinitesimal, will resolve itself, as to art into words, outside art into symbols; the savant will translate it into formulas, the industrial into limited forms; word of poetry and of love; it will manifest itself by music and architecture; divine inspirer, it will engender algorithmy and æsthetics; word of the priest, it will beget science and industry, dogma and worship."

Further on is found the *Genesis* of St. Simonianism, in which is reproduced the tendency to conciliate the flesh with the spirit. The war between these two principles, we are told, exists not only in politics and morals, but also in science; which like politics is in need of peace. This want will be supplied, because the men of love who are equally familiar with theory and practice, science and industry, reality and appearance, will impress a living faith on the constantly advancing harmony of flesh and spirit, of time and space, of number and extent, of formula and form, of thought and action, of unity and multiplicity, of identity and difference, of observation and experiment, of the past and the future, of authority and liberty, of the *ego* and the non-*ego*, of man and woman, of mankind and the world. Were ever disciples before so pelted with words?

Afterwards follows a small epic, a sort of philosophic Ossianic effusion, from which I will give only a few sentences.

“Behold the new Genesis, historical and prophetic, announcing what is destroyed and what is destined to creation; that which must die and that which must be born.

“Listen!

“Marvellous things have I beheld in the night of ancient things.

“The earth said to God, in whose bosom it circulated;—Is the well-beloved about to appear? God answered;—As yet I will not raise him up, for thou hast not a tree under whose shadow he may repose;

not an animal on whose flesh or milk he may feed.
The air which is your covering is burning."

* * * * *

"And another picture was unrolled before me."

"I saw in the ocean, in the bosom of the abyss and on the waves, objects of wonder.

"I beheld unknown regions, I distinguished a promised land, a pledge of the new alliance between God and man.

"The old continents trembled, as trembles a family at the appearance of a new born.

"Islands without number, silent hitherto, were disturbed; and as if to complete their growth, came together and raised their heads above the waters.

"Man extended his domain: victorious over the air he walked it as a conqueror; he lorded it over the tides; he tempered the climates; he subdued the thunder as it were a restive steed."

Those who desire to see the remainder of the Genesis, will find it in M. Reybaud, who gives it at length; but in his later editions apologises for the indulgence which, as a young man, he had shown to this unmeaning rhapsody. He says, "From what has gone before it is easy to estimate the value of the *New Book*, a mysterious Koran, which is in much need of a commentary. In contradistinction to M. Bazard's principal work, the *Exposition*, which was in contact at a hundred points with our ordinary intelligence and our profane science, the *New Book* is the poetry and algebra of religion, its demonstration in rigorous formulas for him who com-

posed them, incomprehensible for all who would desire to discuss them. Never had metaphysics been so mixed up with the differential calculus; never had religion appeared under so binomial a pretension. And the most absurd part is, that after all this labour, and all these quantities and terms, we get at no solution of serious application. When Newton discovered the courses of worlds, he deduced astronomical inferences, material facts, physical laws that the many could comprehend. Here on the contrary, the explanation of humanity by the science of figures, arrives at formulas so utterly fanciful, that we might place a hundred parallel formulas side by side with them, without being able to assign the pre-eminence to any of them." I am disposed to smile at the gravity with which M. Reybaud places Newton and M. Enfantin in juxtaposition. This is indeed, to compare small persons with great.

The sect of St. Simon was drawing to a close. In seven years it had passed through all the phases of folly short of madness: it had enlisted the sympathies of young, clever, and ardent students; it had opened the purse-strings of men; it had played with their feeling and abused their credulity: in its last retreat it had acted a wild drama with players of high ability. Every human weakness had been worked upon, the resources of the Church were almost exhausted, and it needed but a touch to precipitate the tottering fabric into perdition. The Executive Government of Louis Philippe supplied what was wanted.

As early as February, 1832, legal proceedings had

been commenced against the leaders; but it was not till the 27th August that MM. Enfantin, Michel Chevalier, Duveyrier, Barrault, and Rodrigues, were summoned to attend before the *Cour d'Assises*. On the appointed day they made their appearance with great solemnity, arranged so as to form a procession; and in this order, between two lines of spectators, marched to the old *Palais de Justice*, that had witnessed many strange trials, but none of men more whimsical than these. Witnesses were produced and examined. The accused were then called on for their defence, and each of them made an emphatic and ostentatious speech. M. Enfantin exhibited his usual pre-eminence of folly, by staring at the judge and jurymen in a way that he had found efficacious among his novices. The Court being composed of worldlings obstinately bent on executing justice, and without respect for M. Enfantin's sacred character, was not fascinated by the supernatural glances; but exhibited signs of impatience, which however, the adept unhappily misinterpreted as a proof of his power over them. "Irritation," he cried, "is a proof of action. I have conquered you" (addressing the jury). The other accused did their best to rival this absurdity. M. M. Chevalier and others appealed to mathematics, history, poetry, æsthetics, to prove their leader in the right. Every one who is familiar with courts of justice, knows what prejudice would accrue to the cause of the accused, from such wild demeanour. Juries perhaps, are especially influenced by considerations foreign to the question in hand: but judges themselves are far

from being guided by pure reason; as we shall believe when we recall what an English judge told Sir Samuel Romilly: that he had sentenced a man to death for a trifling offence, because the criminal had feigned madness, an impertinence worthy of the halter. Such defences as those put forth by the St. Simonian leaders, were sufficient to convict them of any imaginable crime. If they could have been reasonable enough to place themselves in the hands of counsel, and to answer quietly the interrogatories put to them, they might probably have been acquitted. M. Enfantin was condemned to a short imprisonment.

This was a decisive blow to the St. Simonian community. The means of living were exhausted, and it was necessary to have recourse to new modes of staving off want. The disciples who remained at Ménilmontant often visited the neighbouring taverns, and by frugal repasts prepared themselves for the hardships of the apostolate. Missions were sent to Marseilles, Lyons, Toulon, and Rouen. Worldly labours even of the humblest kind were accepted if not sought: apostles might be seen carrying luggage through the streets; others hired themselves to gather the vintage, demanding no wages beyond their share of the labourers' victuals; some became *buttres* with the Lyonnese, others weavers with the Normans. At last, the imprisonment of M. Enfantin caused a final dispersion. Some of the disciples returned to the world with the intention of secretly carrying on the work of conversion; while others openly set out on their travels

in search of the long expected female Messiah. M. Enfantin on his release from prison followed these travellers, and, after having failed in an undertaking on the Nile, he returned quietly to France, but was subsequently sent as a member of a scientific commission to explore Algeria. Thus ended the follies of the sect.

SECTION VI.—Louis Blanc's opinion of St. Simonianism—Unequalled audacity—This denied as to religion, property, marriage—Objection that the State made to swallow up the individual—The State the sole proprietor—These objections well founded.

In estimating the character of the New Christianity, and its practical development, it is interesting to know what is thought of it by other innovators. Of these, we find few bolder or more determined than Louis Blanc; and his few sentences on the sect of St. Simon that I have met with, are of a decisive character.

Louis Blanc characterizes St. Simonianism as the most audacious of modern innovations. I have not yet explained the peculiar doctrines or practices of other modern innovators; but when I have done so I think it will be admitted that audacity is not peculiar to St. Simonianism, and that other sects are in this respect, worthy rivals, if not decided superiors. A good deal certainly, will depend on the period which we take into consideration. If we have regard only to

Ménilmontant and its childish exhibitions, with the succeeding defences in the Cour d' Assise, and the subsequent travels of some of the members in search of the female Messiah, we may almost esteem M. Enfantin as a modern Don Quixote, and we can by no means look upon his followers as approaching in good sense to the proverbial Sancho. But many of the able and enthusiastic students who clustered around the Enfantin-Bazard throne, may be excused if they denounce the last periods of the sect as representing only a bastard sort of St. Simonianism; and if they refer to the earlier years, from 1825 to 1830, as those in which the religion was in its purity. Absurd and almost blasphemous as were many of the tenets and practices of the new Church, it cannot be said that either in these respects, or in the degree of audacity, was there any predominance over other innovations.

As to religion for example. The St. Simonians did not deny its importance: they insisted that it was essential to society: they did not denounce Christianity as an imposture: they did not erect an altar to the Goddess of Reason and dance around a courtesan as her representative: they did not start with a declaration that there is no God. Their belief in Christianity indeed, was of an extraordinary kind, scarcely so strong as that of the Mahometans, who own that our prophet was sent by heaven; their deification of poetry, eloquence, and the fine arts, with their acknowledgment of the professors of these arts as their priests, would in England have been regarded as Midsummer

madness : yet among so many worse follies that France has teemed with, it would be unjust to say that the St. Simonians are dishonourably distinguished.

So with respect to the two other institutions on which we commonly regard society as founded. Setting aside the monkish community of M^énilmontant, the dogma of the sect was distinctly pronounced in favour of private property. The notion of abolishing inheritance, and of making the State the heir of deceased persons, was wild enough, and well fitted to lead to endless evasions and complications; besides having a direct tendency to vastly increased waste and dilapidation : but it was far from the intention of St. Simon, and of his immediate followers, to abolish private possessions; as is evidenced by their proverbial maxim, "To every one according to his capacity," &c. Communism levels and equalises all: it gives to all capacities alike, and has no regard to the merits or the industry of men. Nothing can be more distinct than the disavowal of communism in the letter, already quoted, to the President of the Chamber of Deputies in 1830. "The system of community of property is universally understood, as an equal distribution among all the members of society, both of the instruments of production, and of the fruits of the labour of all.

"The St. Simonians reject this equal partition of property, which in their eyes would be an act of the greatest violence, an injustice more revolting than the unequal partition originally effected by the force of arms, and conquest :

“For they believe in the *natural inequality* of men, and look upon this inequality as the very basis of association, and the indispensable condition of social order.

“They reject the system of community of goods: for this community would be a manifest violation of the first of all the moral laws which it is their appointed mission to teach, and which requires that for the future, everyone should be placed according to his capacity, and rewarded according to his works.”

It cannot be said then, that the St. Simonians, in their greatest and best period, were opposed to the institution of private property. And as regards marriage, their declarations are equally distinct. Here again, the dogmas of the sect are absurd enough, but are far from going the lengths of other sects in desiring an essential change in the relation of family life. The sect talked much of the necessity of enfranchising the weaker sex: it said that as one man has hitherto been the subject of exploitation by another man, so has woman hitherto been the subject of exploitation by man. But it was plainly denied that it was proposed to raise the condition of women by abolishing marriage.

“Christianity has lifted women out of servitude, but it has condemned them to subordination; and throughout Christian Europe we find them still stricken with religious, political, and civil interdiction.

“The St. Simonians have appeared to announce their definitive enfranchisement, their complete emancipation, but without pretending on that account, to abolish the holy law of marriage proclaimed by Christianity: on

the contrary, they come to accomplish this law, to confer on it a new sanction, to add to the force and *inviolability* of the union that it consecrates.

“They require, as Christians, that one man should be joined to one woman, but they teach that the wife should be the equal of the husband; and that in accordance with the especial grace which God has bestowed on her sex, she should be associated with him in the exercise of the triple function of the temple, of the state, and of the family: so that the social individual who up to the present day, has been man alone, should hereafter consist of man and woman.

“The religion of St. Simon comes to put an end only to that disgraceful traffic, that legal prostitution, which under the guise of marriage, so often consecrates the monstrous union of devotedness and egotism, of enlightenment and ignorance, of youth and decrepitude.”

These declarations are as distinct as they can be, both as to private property and marriage. The proposed abolition of private inheritance would no doubt, complicate the one, as the loud claim of the “rights of women” would perplex the other: but I see no reason to question the sincerity of the professions made in either case. The intention in abolishing private inheritance was to make it possible to carry out the maxim, *to everyone according to his capacity*: it was concealed under the pretence that this last privilege of birth, ought to share the fate of all other privileges of birth, long since extinct. This pretence was an appeal to the democratic desire of equality.

But since the St. Simonians did not profess atheism, communism of goods, or communism of wives, I cannot agree with M. Louis Blanc that the *doctrine* was the most audacious of modern innovations.

Another objection made by the same author, is, that St. Simon conferred too much power on the State: that instead of limiting the State to the duties of initiating, of restraining, and of occasionally stimulating, he imposed on it the business of regulating the affairs of common life in each detail. Every sober-minded Englishman will agree in this objection, and will look with the most positive dislike on an organization in which the individual is swallowed up in a hierarchy. He will instinctively shudder at the thought of this modern Venetian aristocracy, and will ask, what is the hope of progress under such a system? The St. Simonians professed a belief in the indefinite perfectibility of man: but it may well be questioned whether under such an organization as theirs, any progress towards perfection would long be made. Everyone, it is said, being set to do that for which he is best fitted, all the duties of society would be performed better than they are at present. This statement assumes that the distribution of employments would really be made according to the abilities of men: that we should not find Burns guiding a plough, or gauging whiskey; Hogg folding sheep or miscultivating a moorland farm; Coleridge, under the assumed name Cumberbach, attempting to groom a horse or vainly struggling to keep his saddle in the riding school; a Duke of York sacrificing his men in the marshes of

Walcheren; Dalrymple and Burrard superseding the Great Captain in the moment of victory. The St. Simonians professed to solve the problem of the day; to put the right man in the right place. But it is not at all evident, by what means they could accomplish this feat. We are not told by what alchemy they could analyse the minds of men; by what process they could separate the gold from the dross, so as to set aside the pure metal for the service of the temple, and leave the baser parts for the inferior offices of life. The excellence of a priest, of a leader, of a ruler, is quite as much of a moral as of an intellectual nature; and a hierarchy formed by examination of the understanding, would inevitably exalt, in many instances, the worst of men, and leave the best of men below. No doubt, we are exposed by our present reliance on birth and accident, to these same evils. But under the St. Simonian scheme, every vocation is to be filled up by the means of examination and supposed fitness: at present it is only the few offices of government with which any interference takes place. In an overwhelming majority of cases, men choose their own occupations, and if they choose them amiss no one is blamed: whereas under this whimsical régime, every instance of an inefficient ruler, or unskilful artist, or uncleanly cook, or bungling cobbler, would be laid at the door of the government who appointed him. We hear infinite complaints of the multitude of government employés in France: under the St. Simonians every man would be a government employé.

Finally, M. Louis Blanc objects that St. Simon made the State the sole proprietor of all land and other immoveable property, assigning to individuals only the usufruct for life, with not even the power of bequeathing to a child or a friend, the savings of a lifetime. Under St. Simon the state is proprietor: under Louis Blanc's scheme society is proprietor: under all civilized governments individuals are proprietors. Long may our present arrangements subsist! Far from us be the overwhelming influence of state and of society! We want among us no overwhelming centralized power, no tyrannous democratic majority. Individualism, as far as we can see, is the only régime that develops the intellectual and moral excellencies of man, that guards his freedom, and raises him in the scale of being.

CHAPTER III.

FOURIER.

SECTION I.—Fourier's birth, vocation, character—First publication, 1808—Obscure style—Desire of a patron—Comparison of public and private patronage—Second publication—*Passionate attraction*—Explained—Other works—Samples of his mode, cosmogony, and psychology.

CHARLES FOURIER was by birth and original circumstances, widely separated from the hero of the last chapter. St. Simon was of a very noble family, entitled under the old aristocratic régime to official rank in the army; first a soldier then a philosopher: but Fourier was of plebeian origin, the son of a small tradesman at Besançon; himself a merchant's clerk, and unable to rise in a country where indeed, it is not easy for any one to rise in the career of commerce. Even in England or the United States probably, Fourier would not have emerged from his humble position. His mind was intent on science, literature, the invention of social theories: and such men do not commonly advance in worldly position: for it is not by knowledge, imagination, or intellectual invention, that fortunes are accumulated. Liberal education, superiority of understanding, are useful to the literary man, are ornamental to the wealthy man, but are

frequently little better than a drag on one who has to live by his industry. A man can scarcely expect any eminent success in a pursuit to which he does not devote himself with ardour; and one whose thoughts are frequently bent on the solution of difficult problems in science or morals, will not be enthusiastic in the drier occupations by which money is earned. Those who recommend education on the ground that it promotes success in life, take up a position they will find it hard to maintain. The coarse and illiterate man of business, with notions confined and concentrated on money getting, will usually outstrip the student whom circumstances have drawn into the vortex of commerce.

Fourier, it is alleged by his admirers, was a person of great ability and of extraordinary attainments. In all his books, as we are told by M. Reybaud, the most remarkable thing is the extent and depth of the reading exhibited. There is a weight and authority in his dealings with natural science: he shows his knowledge of literature by a host of happy quotations; his recollections of history by the facts he adduces in support of his opinions; his acquaintance with affairs by observations of a wide range and of excellent sense; his mathematical studies by the severe deductions he borrows from them; his familiarity with philosophy by his constant and able attacks on it at every point. The simple commercial clerk ran the round of science, literature, and philosophy, and pronounced them all stricken with barrenness. This is the eulogistic side of the

picture: the *avvocato del diavolo* denies the truth of the praises, and pronounces Fourier a pretender in science and literature: no one however, can refuse him the credit of invention or of constancy of purpose.

Charles Fourier was born as early as 1772, and was therefore strictly a contemporary of St. Simon; having like him attained to the age of manhood before the horrors of the revolution broke out. He published his first work long before he became at all known to the world, although he was far from being a precocious author. The *Théorie des Quatre Mouvements* came out in 1808, and is said to contain the whole theory of its author; the subsequent works being mere developments of the first. Fourier, we are told, did not anticipate any popularity for his book. He knew that it was ill calculated to please the many. But he entertained a hope that it would attract the attention of some rich or powerful person, of a banker, of a nobleman, possibly of a king. This is perhaps, one reason to be assigned for the harshness and obscurity of his style; for if he had aimed at public favour, he would not have ventured to wrap up his meaning in enigmatical and whimsical expressions, but would have condescended to use such language as busy men understand without labour. Next to the choice of a popular subject, an easy and lively style is the surest passport to success.

The rich and the great however, neglected Fourier. He had hoped "that the magnificence of his results, the beauty of his solutions, their scientific arrangement, the pomp and grandeur of his schemes, their extent and

utility, would secure either an ostentatious patronage or a great financial combination. He waited patiently and silently, because he was in daily expectation of a decisive experiment. This was one of Fourier's illusions. Neither the aristocracy of birth nor the aristocracy of wealth, was attracted by the wonders scattered through his volume. What interest could be felt by these two powers, in changing a world that treated them so well? The power they possessed might well content them."

The time of the publication of the *Théorie des Quatre Mouvements*, was certainly unfavourable to novelties. The French had scarcely recovered from the shock which the horrors of a dozen years before had caused them. They had not had time to forget the fathers, brothers, lovers, who had died in the prisons or by the guillotine, or who were still wasting their lives in exile and poverty. Sixteen years of war, scarcely interrupted by an armed truce, had decimated every family by the conscription, and still pressed heavily on each house where a son remained. The French fleet had been destroyed, and perfidious Albion sweeping the seas, combined with the Milan decrees to raise to an oppressive height, many of the necessities of life. Was this a time to indulge in new theories on the constitution of the world; to foster and bring into the light, a new Rousseau, an Helvetius, or an Abbé Sièyes, to declaim publicly against civilization and the existing order of society? The people no doubt, writhed under the conscription, was oppressed and miserable, as the French

people has been for centuries. Yet it longed, not for new theories and whimsical organizations, but for peace without and order at home. However brilliant and attractive might have been Fourier's style, he would have enrolled few disciples at such a time; and if he had found himself with followers, would have met with small favour from Napoleon, who was little disposed to protect or tolerate *Idealists*.

Fourier's notion of looking for patronage to one powerful man rather than to the public, was singular. Authors who propose to effect revolutions, whether political or social, naturally address themselves to the many, to whom the hopes of change are generally palatable. Besides, according to the ideas that now prevail, it is far more consistent with the dignity of authorship, to depend on society than to depend on one member of it. The nobleman, or rich commoner, may be expected to require services, or subserviency at least, in return for the patronage he bestows: while the world at large, which purchases a popular book, from no motive but its own gratification, does not establish any claim upon the gratitude of the author. It is inferred therefore, that the largely increased circle of readers, has conferred upon writers an independence of position which they did not formerly enjoy.

It cannot be disputed that this is absolutely true of authors like Scott, Macaulay, Dickens; who have enjoyed both an amount of wealth and an independence of position, which no patron could have bestowed. But

these men have written on popular topics, such as were exactly calculated to secure the applauses of the many. The case is quite different if we turn to another class of subjects. Suppose a man has a strong conviction on some branch of practical morals, and is desirous of calling public attention to it; feeling that a reformation would remove many of the grievances under which a particular class of society labours. He is deeply impressed perhaps, with the evils that wait upon the religious and philanthropical meetings that are constantly being held: he feels moved to denounce the hollowness, the self-seeking, the almost hypocrisy, the unquestionable ostentation, the self-consciousness, the pharisaical self-righteousness, that characterise the proceedings, not only at Exeter Hall, not only among the so-called saints, but in every public room, and by every class of religionists, in these kingdoms: he would like to compare the oily demeanour of the speakers on the platform, with their hauteur and irritability and moroseness to their families and dependents: his fingers itch to write a denunciation of the printed subscription lists, as a disgusting inconsistency with the scriptural command, when thou givest alms let not thy right hand know what thy left hand doeth. Let this young and inexperienced man write down his thoughts in plain language such as may be understood by all: think you that he will find a publisher? Let him print at his own expense: will he find readers? Let him make up his account to be utterly neglected, or at the best, to be abused by two or three prints and then forgotten.

No: if he wants the public patronage, he must take the other side; he must compare old times with new, and show that all virtue and excellence are ours, while our ancestors lived in Egyptian darkness. He must secure the suffrages of all the religious teachers of the day, by praising their periodical gatherings, and lauding the modern modesty and self-sacrifice. If indeed, he have the genius of a Dickens, he may spare a page here and there, even to denounce popular misdoings: but wanting the afflatus to give such zest to his pages, let him, if he desire public patronage, run with the popular current. Let him not try to turn the stream back unless he would be drowned in its waters.

Popular patronage too, is very limited in its sphere. It cannot be applicable to any authors but those who write moderately amusing works, or certainly not to those who employ themselves on dry topics. Mathematicians would enjoy but lenten entertainment, if they had to live by the popular sale of their treatises on the calculus or the undulatory theory of light. Our universities fortunately, supply the patronage required. Writers on mental philosophy, wanting this assistance, may naturally sigh for the past days, when the Mécenas furnished the means of living hardly gained at present from the public. Locke's treatise on the understanding must have cost him the intense labour of years, and if a work of as much originality now appeared, in a form equally uninviting, the first year would not sell as many copies as would pay for the advertising. David Hume's early work, notwithstanding the charm of his

style, and although his sceptical tone was far from repugnant to the taste of the day, fell still-born from the press. What success would Sir William Hamilton have had as a mere author, divested of his title and his professorship?

Nay, this deficiency of public patronage is not confined to dry subjects: it extends to new forms of subjects that are in themselves interesting. Scott's poetry met a ready sale, because there was no particular novelty in its garb to counteract the effect of sweet and spirited poems: Byron's was still more successful, for it had nothing in its outward dress to militate against the received canons of criticism. But Coleridge was not happy enough to enjoy so rapid a popularity, and if Wordsworth had depended on his verses for his daily bread, he must have renounced his adopted style, or starved.

When successful authors then, chaunt the praises of public patronage, let them remember that there is a good deal to be said on the other side. A popular writer of history or romance, is doubtless far better paid, as well as far more independent in position, than he would have been a century ago. But authors of great industry, and even of high ability, who have chosen dry subjects as their pursuit, may protest against the present condition of literature as very unsatisfactory to them. The public, a munificent patron of all works that amuse as well as instruct, a ready buyer of every book that stimulates the affections or the imagination, turns its back on everything that requires close atten-

tion, and hates a chain of reasoning however admirably constructed.

Fourier then, estimated men aright, when he set it down as certain that the public would neglect him and his paradoxes. His hope of finding a patron was disappointed. Had he foreseen this ill-fortune, he might perhaps have seen fit to mitigate the harshness of his style, of which Louis Blanc says that he enveloped the ideas that constitute his system, in whimsical unintelligible phrases; and that a literary man putting those ideas into intelligible French, found a ready sale for his work.

During the long period of fourteen years, from 1808 to 1822, Fourier remained silent; but at length at fifty years old, he again emerged from the ungrateful labours of the counting-house, and published his *Treatise on domestic agricultural association*. Though six volumes were announced only two appeared: but these seem to have been quite sufficient for the development of his vast plan, announced fourteen years earlier. Fourteen years! All those who have ever had a scheme of their own invention which they have laboured to think out, will sympathize with the sickness of heart, the melancholy musings, the repinings at the fetters of poverty, the half-indulged aspirations after future distinction, which must have beset the merchant's clerk. Fourier however, exhibited no misgivings as to his due place in the intellectual hierarchy. He boldly claimed his position by the side of Newton; asserting that as the great astronomer had discovered the law

of material attraction, he, the neglected inventor, had discovered the law of *passionate attraction*. Universal analogy, he said, the harmonious unity that presides over creation, must be regarded as incompatible with the present inconsistent and miserable condition of mankind. He was full of faith, says his expositor, in the author of our being; and remembering the order and harmony of creation, as revealed by Newton, he held that the same order and the same harmony ought to follow from a similar law in the moral world. Starting from this principle, all the disorders and evils of mankind seemed to him explained by the oppression and constraint that had taken the place of attraction, and that had caused the subversion of natural sentiments. By means of profound study and severe calculation, unveiling the mystery of human destiny, he discovered a new social order, in which all the passions would become the natural pledges of peace, concord, harmony; under which, man would enjoy the only possible real freedom, by obeying the law of attraction, the divine law which governs this globe and the universe.

This passionate attraction, discovered by the moral Newton of Besançon, is the principle on which is founded association, the cure for all the ills of humanity. "And how to attain to the unity of the globe, how establish harmony on this earth which at present resembles a chaos? All that is necessary is to disengage from this chaos the elements of *association*; and to construct with them, according to the system explained by Fourier, a new social mechanism, of which the natural effect

is to secure well-being to all, and to render the passions the instruments of concord and harmony." These two notions of establishing harmony in the world, and of regarding its author as another Newton, reappear constantly. "Society is an untuned harmony, a discord, from which men persist in drawing false and unmusical sounds; and it is only necessary to tune the instrument to transform the music at once into a series of true and sweet harmonies. *The law of association* discovered by Fourier naturally follows from the Newtonian calculation on attraction; it applies to the social world the theory of Newton on the equilibrium of the universe."

According to Fourier then, the harmony and completeness of the material universe, indicate the harmony and well-being which men might enjoy under a fit social organization. He treated the universal problems, why does evil exist, and above all, why does moral evil exist, in a way of his own: not by trying to solve them, but by denying the data. Adopt my system and these evils will cease. Moralists, hitherto, heathen no less than Christian, have taught the necessity of restraining the passions; and this teaching, according to the harmonious system, causes the misery of the world. "We ought to return to the normal and well-arranged laws of creation. All the passions should find their place in the human system, as the celestial bodies find theirs in the sidereal system. For this purpose it is sufficient to abandon them successively to their inherent impulsion, ceasing to offer them an opposition which tends to throw them violently out of their orbits.

If the conditions of the social medium are opposed to the free development of the passions, it is not the passions themselves which we should accuse; for these, good or bad, are of divine inspiration and therefore legitimate and unchangeable; but we should accuse the social medium, the creation of man, perishable like himself, and capable of modification at his pleasure." The consequences of such an ethical creed as this, are tolerably obvious. Epicurus would have disclaimed the system, almost as decisively as Zeno.

Fourier published other works: *the New Industrial World*, in 1829: a pamphlet against St. Simon and Owen: *la fausse Industrie*: and others, all of them developments of these leading ideas. "Having imagined a world of which agriculture was the first, and association the moving power, he undertook to regulate the most minute particulars; a task that led him into diffuse details such as it is difficult to follow." He differed strikingly in this respect from St. Simon, whose New Christianity was of a most general character, leaving all particulars to be filled up by the disciples: a latitude that as we have seen, was one of the causes of the speedy disruption of the sect. Fourier far more nearly resembled in this laborious manipulation of minutiae, our own distinguished Bentham, who in what he called a mere outline of a new poor-law scheme, addressed to Young's *Annals of Agriculture*, insensibly got so involved in particulars as to occupy two or three hundred pages with this sketch. I do not mean to be guilty of the injustice towards Bentham of sug-

gesting the existence of any similarity between him and Fourier in more important respects.

The details of the new harmonious system, together with the whimsical, obscure, style in which they were expressed, laid Fourier open to much ridicule; and to raise a hearty laugh is of far more importance to many of the periodicals that lead public opinion, than to seek truth or to do justice. Fourier and his eccentricities became the butt of the Paris wits; and the laugh was so loud and long-continued that it travelled across the Channel to our own shores. It must be confessed however, that whatever were Fourier's abilities and industry, he must have sadly wanted a sense of the ridiculous. I quote a few passages given by M. Reybaud in a note. I select such as do not bear on the details of the social system, that I may not anticipate the contents of a subsequent section. The following are from the *Théorie des Quatre Mouvements* :—

“To believe that the earth will produce no more new creations and will limit itself to those we see, would be to believe that a woman who has had one child, cannot have a second, a third, a tenth. The earth in the same way will produce successive creations.

“The first creation, the products of which we see, has furnished an immense number of noxious animals on land and still more in the seas. Those persons who believe in demons, ought surely to think that hell presided at this creation, when they behold Moloch and Belial breathing under the form of tiger and ape. Eh! What is there which hell in its fury, could

invent worse than the rattlesnake, the bug, the legions of insects and reptiles, marine monsters, poisons, the plague, madness, leprosy, gout, and so many seeds of disorders, imagined to torment mankind and to make this globe an anticipation of hell !

“Further on it will be seen what kinds of products will be given to earth and sea by future creations. As to the present time, we are ignorant even how to use the little good which the first creation has supplied ; and I will cite as a proof of this, four quadrupeds, the lama, the rein-deer, the zebra, and the beaver. Of the two first we are destitute through our clumsiness, our cruelty, and our folly. These are the obstacles that prevent us from rearing herds of lamas and rein-deer in all the lofty mountain chains on which they might be acclimated. Other social vices rob us of the beaver, not less precious for its wool than the lama, and of the zebra no less valuable than the horse for its speed, vigour, and beauty. In our cattle yards, and in our social habits, there prevails a roughness, an ignorance, which prevent us from domesticating these animals. The approaching period of creation, which is the eighth, will exhibit to us zebras and conayas living as tamely as horses and asses ; beavers will be seen building their houses and constructing their republics in the bosom of populous provinces ; herds of lamas will be as common in the mountains as flocks of sheep. And how many other animals, such as the ostrich, the deer, &c. will gather around mankind, as soon as they find allurements to fix them, allurements that the

present order of civilization hinders us from offering. Thus this creation, in itself poor and noxious, is doubly poor for us; and through social ignorance we fail to use the greater part of the good that the three kingdoms offer.

“In the mean time the earth is violently agitated, as we know from the frequent recurrence of the aurora borealis, which is a proof of the prolific power of the planet. Nothing can come of this until the human race has made the necessary preparations. For this purpose the population of the world must rise to two thousand millions, an increase that will require a century to accomplish it.

“When the two milliards of inhabitants shall have subdued the earth up to the sixty-fifth degree, there will arise a boreal crown which will supply heat and light to the frozen arctic regions. These new lands supplied to industry, will allow a further augmentation of the race up to the grand total of three milliards.

“*Boreal Crown.* When the human race shall have occupied the earth beyond the sixtieth degree north, the temperature of the planet will become much milder and more regular. The prolific power will gain more activity: the aurora borealis becoming very frequent, will be stationed at the pole, and will assume the form of a ring or crown. The fluid which is at present only luminous, will then give heat as well as light.

“I will add on this subject, that the prediction of this meteor will not seem extraordinary, if we consider the rings of Saturn. Why should not the Almighty grant

to us that which he has bestowed on other globes? Is the existence of the polar ring more incomprehensible than that of the equatorial girdles with which Saturn is surrounded? If God can give to a globe circular surroundings, he can also give polar rings.

“Note. To conclude: when the different principles of mitigation shall be in operation on the Earth’s atmosphere, the worst climate, such as that of Okhotsk or Yakoutsk, may reckon on eight or nine months of fair weather every year, and on a climate free from fogs and hurricanes, which will be unknown in the interior and very rare even on the sea-coast.

“It is understood that these ameliorations will be modified by high mountains and the vicinity of seas; especially at the three points of the continent which are near the south pole, which will enjoy no crown, and which will remain for ever buried in hoar frosts. This will not hinder the lands in the neighbourhood of this pole from sharing otherwise in the influence of the crown, which among other improvements will change the taste of the salt water, and will decompose or precipitate the bituminous particles by the expansion of a *citric boreal acid*. This fluid combined with sea-salt, will give sea-water a flavour of a kind of lemonade which we call *aigresel*. This water will then be easily separable from its saline and citric particles, and brought into a pure state, a change which will dispense with the provisioning ships with fresh water. This decomposition of sea-water by the boreal fluid, is one of the preliminaries necessary for the new marine creations;

which will furnish a crowd of amphibious servants, for the use of fishermen and for towing ships; thus replacing frightful legions of marine monsters, which will become extinct through the action of the boreal fluid and the consequent decomposition of the sea. A sudden death will purge the ocean of these monsters, images of our passions."

Such is a taste of Fourier's cosmogony, which reads more like a madman's dream than the grave composition of a sound mind. No wonder the Parisians laughed: no wonder that the long-expected patron failed to present himself. Fourier, it seems to be understood, was no jester, and not likely to amuse himself with practising on the credulity of men. Otherwise we might have supposed that this was only grave banter like Swift's Brobdignagians and Houhynyms. If it had been such however, laughter would have ceased; for the 'fun consisted in the simplicity and gravity of the author of this rhapsody: and if Fourier had proposed it as a jest, he would have taken care to let the public know his intention, and would thus have turned the tables on the jesters. The good bishop who said of "*Gulliver's Travels*" that there were some things which he really could scarcely believe, did not find the laugh on his side; and if the Parisian wits had found themselves hoaxed by Fourier, gravity would have succeeded to their mirth. We must believe then, if we can, that Fourier was in earnest. His psychology has its marvels too.

"The most unfortunate planet is that in which the

inhabitants have passions out of proportion to the means of enjoyment. Such is the vice which at the present time afflicts our globe. It renders the situation of the human race so oppressive, that discontent breaks out even among sovereigns.

“This arises from the fact, that God has given to our passions an intensity suitable to two phases of *combined order*, which will embrace nearly seventy thousand years, and in the course of which every day will afford us enjoyments so active, so varied, that our souls will hardly suffice. If our destiny were limited to the present sombre civilization, God would have given us passions as cold and apathetic as philosophy recommends, passions fit for our miserable existence of the past five thousand years. Their activity of which we complain, is the pledge of our future happiness.

“Should the Deity have given us to foresee our brilliant destiny? Undoubtedly, no. This foreknowledge would have been for our progenitors a subject of continual grief, because the imperfection of industry would have forced them to remain in the incoherent order. Universal apathy would have possessed these nations: no one would have laboured to prepare a well being so distant. Even now, when we boast of our reason, people are slow in embarking on certain enterprises, such as planting forests, because a generation must elapse before the advantage is reaped. What would have happened if the first men had had a glimpse of this future social harmony, the fruit of industrial progress? Far from labouring for an age distant by

twenty centuries, they would have asked: 'Why should we be the servants of men to be born two thousand years hence? Let us smother at its birth this industry, of which they alone will gather the fruit.—Is not such the temper of men? Witness the father who reproaches his children with the newly-invented luxury they enjoy in their tender age. If I so surely announce universal harmony as close at hand, it is because the organization of the societary state requires only two years more, reckoning from the day when one province shall have made its preparations of buildings and plantations. The frailest of men therefore, hoping still to live two years, may please himself with the notion of organizing the progressive sects.

“At present, man may leave this life without regret; since he will have the assurance of his soul's immortality, of which he could not be secure without the invention of the laws of social movement. Hitherto, our notions of a future life have been so vague, the pictures of it have been so terrifying, that immortality has been an object of terror rather than of consolation. Belief therefore, has been very feeble, and it was scarcely to be desired that it should be more valid. God does not suffer that so long as the incoherent order prevails, there should be secure ideas of a future life. If people were convinced of it, the poorest people among the civilized would commit suicide, since a future life could not be to them worse than the present. The rich alone would remain; and they would be neither fit, nor disposed, to undertake the unpalatable

functions of the poor. Then would civilized life be at an end through the death of those who supported its burden; and in consequence of this conviction of immortality, the globe would remain in a barbarous state."

The notion above, that the miserable, if convinced of immortality, would at once commit suicide, is one which we might be inclined to regard as about as fanciful as any other of the reveries of Fourier: but some of the facts related in Mr. Helps' "Conquest," show that Fourier was nearer the truth than we might have supposed. All readers of Mr. Helps will remember that the oppressed Indians did destroy themselves by hundreds, under the conviction that they should pass to a happier state; and that they were checked in this course of suicide only by the assurance that the cruel Spaniards would follow them into the land of spirits.

"Lo! the poor Indian, whose untutored mind
Sees God in clouds and hears him in the wind.
His soul kind science never taught to stray
Far as the solar walk or milky way.
Yet simple nature to his hopes has given
Behind the cloud-topped hill a humbler heaven
He thinks, admitted to that equal sky,
His faithful dog shall bear him company"

POPE.

I give one more quotation, to complete our general notion of Fourier's deductive and dogmatic philosophy.

"This question of the enjoyments reserved for our souls in a future life, exhibits the absolute ignorance on the part of civilization, of the views of nature. Ill do you understand her, when you make future happiness to consist in the disunion of the two principles, the

material and the spiritual; and when you presume that our souls, after the decease of the body, will be separated from matter, without the combination of which, there would not be even to the Deity any enjoyment! The only enlightenment that it is proper to give you on this topic of a future life, is, to disabuse you of the notion of an incoherence in the state of the dead and of the living. Abandon the idea that the souls of the departed cease to have any connection with this world: there are ties and relations between the one and the other life; it shall be proved to you that the souls of the defunct vegetate in a state of languor and solicitude, in which ours participate until the present condition of the earth is amended. So long as the world shall remain in a chaotic state, so contrary to the views of God, the souls of its inhabitants shall suffer for it in the other life as in this; and the happiness of the dead shall commence only with that of the living, with the cessation of the state called civilized, but barbarous and savage.

“The theory of the social world, in communicating to you the destiny reserved for your souls, in the various worlds that they will visit, will teach you that souls after this life are re-united to matter, without ever losing sensuous enjoyments. This is not the place for entering on this discussion, any more than on that of the causes which for a time deprive our souls of the remembrance of their past existence. Where were they before they inhabited our bodies? God, who creates not anything from nothing, cannot have formed our souls from nothing; and if you believe that they

had no existence before the bodies, you are very near believing that they will return to that nothing from which your prejudices have called them."

These extracts may serve to show the character of Fourier's so-called philosophy. I am not aware of any reason for supposing that he was trifling with his few readers, nor is it alleged, as far as I know, that he was not in earnest in this his revelation. For it is as a revelation that the cosmogony and the psychology must be judged; since it would be absurd to discuss alleged proofs of things which in their very nature are out of our reach. We must suppose that the author, living in days of political and social disorganization, confounded with the strange turns and chances of national fortune, tied to an unpalatable occupation, ridiculed by the wits, and disappointed of a patron, gave himself up to reverie, and living in cloud-land, ceased to distinguish accurately between fiction and reality, between invention and deduction: just as it may happen even to a sober-minded man to have a dream so vivid as to lead him to act on it unconsciously the following day; or to have a vision of the night commenced in sleep, continued in a state of dozing, and completed in waking moments, of which the parts shall be so blended together that they cannot be separated. We cannot wonder that the Parisians made themselves merry with Fourier's philosophy. The portions which in England would have appeared the most respectable, would furnish in France a fund of infinite amusement. To believe in God? absurd! To anticipate a future existence? Monstrous.

To embrace the creed of Fourier? Men might as well be Christians at once.

I ought to add one quotation from M. Louis Reybaud, who, as a Frenchman himself, ought to judge more correctly of Fourier than I can pretend to do. Introducing the fragments some of which I have already given, he says: "In order to modify the effect they may produce, it is right to say that Fourier himself made light of his attempts at a general system of analogy, of cosmogony, of psychology, and of divination. Remembering the severe temper of his mind, should we think that by the sallies of imagination he was willing to secure the attention of a people essentially satirical, in order to avoid, even at the price of some sarcasm, that weariness which is the common attendant upon a purely scientific work?"

SECTION II.—Proposed social system—Evils of present civilization—War, police, unproductive labourers—Proposed communism—Modified, not absolute—Amazing results as to happiness—Union of the whole world, with Constantinople as the capital—Industrial armies to subdue the deserts—Trebled longevity.

Having endeavoured to give some notion of Fourier's character and of his philosophy, I proceed to describe the system he proposed for the amelioration of the human race. In the former section of this chapter, I have been indebted principally to M. Louis Reybaud, although I have compared all his assertions with what

I have found elsewhere. I now have recourse especially to the volume entitled *Fourier et son Système*, by *Madame Gatti de Gamond*. This lady was a professed admirer and disciple of Fourier: her work was published in 1838.

We have already seen that Fourier regarded himself as the discoverer of a new and unheard of principle; and maintained that as Newton had given to men the law of material attraction, by which the sidereal system is regulated, so he, Fourier, the modern Newton of the mental world, had arrived by deep thought and long study at the law of moral attraction by which society was hereafter to be governed. "Setting out from this principle, all the disorders and all the ills of mankind seemed to him explained by the oppression and constraint substituted for attraction, and effecting the subversion of natural sentiments."

One of the crying evils of society as at present organized, is thus explained. "In a well-arranged society, all the members ought to be at once producers and consumers, fairly remunerated in proportion to their contribution of capital, labour, and talent; exchanging their products among each other by means of a representative unit, and thus supplying unfailing markets to each other by reciprocal profit and consumption. This is the simplest principle of social economy; and yet in our present society it remains unrealized, through the system of disorder in labours and partition of households, causing a crowd of unproductive agents, who constitute at least two-thirds of the

population. This is an unfailing source of misery, corruption and disorder.

“In order that all the members of the body social should be at once producers and consumers, all must be productive labourers. But society is so organised that a great majority of its members labour unproductively, or even do mischief by their work. I have already observed that there are but few voluntary idlers, or men of fortune, who are intent only on their pleasures. They are too few to cause much injury, and besides they are useful by the employment of their capitals. The true social sore, the cause of the excessive inequality of fortunes, of unbounded luxury and hideous wretchedness, is to be found in the labourers who are unproductive, destructive, pernicious, and mischievous, of whom most not only live at the expense of the social body which they infest, but furnish examples of those sudden and colossal fortunes that discourage laborious men, who seldom rise above mediocrity of position. In the first rank of useless and destructive avocations, we place armies. We shall be told that they are needful to defend the country from foreign aggression. Yes, as the world goes: but are we to believe that the bloody struggle of nations, the ferocious combats between men, the permanent armies which have no aim but destruction, are a part of the providential destiny of humanity, and that there will be no end to this state of things?

“In the second rank of useless employments, that expend to a mere loss, arms, talents, and faculties, comes the crowd of clerks, agents, and others employed in the

various administrations, commercial and fiscal, the custom-houses and the courts. The agents of commerce alone, dealers, merchants, bankers, brokers, unproductive middle-men, who buy to sell again, basing their operations on fraud, monopoly, usury, stock-jobbing, might easily be reduced to one-tenth, as might the carriers. Trade altogether is founded on a system of lies. It is not talent or honesty that conducts to success; all is risk, trick, cunning, the chance of a rise or fall, the play of the exchange. It is not competition but reciprocal hostility. Commerce is nothing but a perpetual stock-jobbing which swallows up agriculture and industry. You may see bankers realize three millions sterling in a year. How many wretches on the other hand are ruined! Commerce as now carried on, exhibits nothing but injustice, fraud, iniquity: the most upright are drawn into dishonesty, and are threatened with shameful insolvency. Stock-jobbing forms a second power in the State, holding the Government under its immediate influence: it is the indirect mover of troubles, revolts, political disturbances. It is a purely parasitical body, which draws the best substance to itself."

There follow more words to the same effect, enlarging on the evils that at present exist in the various avocations of life. Nobody disputes their existence; but many of us hold that Fourier is wrong in regarding these evils as the rule; that they are in truth altogether exceptional; and that industry and honesty are generally, and in the long run, the only sure roads to fortune. No one doubts that armies are unproductive,

and are necessary evils; that police are the same; that courts of justice are no better: but the question with regard to these is how to dispense with them. We shall see what are the remedies that Fourier proposes. As to dealers, agents, and carriers, all these, where trade is free, I believe to be just as valuable members of society as direct producers. It is useless to grow corn or rear cattle or manufacture clothes, unless all these products are distributed over the country to those who want them and can pay for them. And according to the well-established principle of the division of labours, it is more advantageous to society that some should make it their business to buy and sell, than that each producer should deal directly with the consumer. Where there is no monopoly, agents and dealers, by leaving producers at liberty to devote themselves to agriculture or manufactures, and by thus increasing the quantity of raw produce and manufactures, are themselves virtually producers.

Another of the ills that Fourier denounces is the monotony of our present labours. "In what respect is labour repugnant to us? Let us look around for examples, and we shall see that labour is repugnant when it is forced, obligatory, arbitrary: when it is continuous and monotonous; when it is isolated, without competition or rivalry. The peasant who tills his field in solitude twelve hours in the day, with no stimulant but the hope of a crust of bread; the sempstress who alone in her garret plies her needle all day and part of the night, with no stimulant but the necessity of living; the clerk

who grows pale during the twelve hours' sitting at his desk at a disgustful occupation, which leads neither to honour nor promotion, but only to a slender monthly salary: all these pariahs of civilization conceive a deeply seated dislike to their daily task. But change some accessories and at once they will be less repugnant. Harvests and vintages in which the assembled labourers animate each other by joyous songs, and compete in promptitude and skill, are not painful but attractive. Young milliners sitting together, and trying which shall be the first to finish her task, or which shall give most elegance to a bow of ribbon or a corsage, amusing each other with laugh, song, and nonsense, find their work less painful than it is to one who must labour in silence and solitude. Let the clerk have to draw up an interesting paper which is to go into the hands of the minister, and which may lead to promotion, he will at once be full of ardour and emulation. These examples that I could multiply indefinitely, prove that the same task may without changing its character, be repugnant or attractive according to the motives that are offered."

Another of the present evils is our arrangement of the labours of women. "This is the place for examining the prejudice that leads us to banish all women into the interior of the household, and to limit their activity and their faculties to the care of it. Most women have an aptitude and a fondness for household duties and for the education of children; but none like to be limited to these. Women like men have need of variety: nature has provided for the satisfaction of this desire, by giving

to them as to men various aptitudes, artistic and industrial. Notwithstanding the obstacles of education and prejudice, these aptitudes develop themselves in the case of many women whose talents cannot be denied. The cares of a household are so little capable of absorbing women's life, that we see those who belong to the affluent class, employ servants as deputies, and themselves seek variety in pleasures, if not in some attractive pleasure. In the poorer classes, we see unfortunate women obliged to unite the cares of a household and of children, with some avocation as a means of living."

Such are some of the evils pointed out by Fourier, and there will not be much difference of opinion as to the fact of their existence, and as to the desirableness of getting rid of them. All will agree that war is a monster, which swallows up in a year the means that, applied to improving and embellishing a country, would do more than is ordinarily accomplished in twenty years of peace. The keeping on foot a standing army even when no war is going on, is a fearful draught on the resources of a nation. But no means have been as yet devised by which this practice can be abolished; since any one nation has the power of compelling all other nations to arm in self-defence. We may indeed except England which is protected to a considerable extent by the sea. Yet even for England there is required great coolness and resolution to resist the infection of a love of power; and the mortification we suffer when war breaks out, might be a palliation of our folly if we altered our practice and doubled our forces, so as to

save ourselves from being again outnumbered as we lately were by the French in the Crimea. But peace has again seen us resisting the temptation, and lowering our forces to something like our old standard: exhibiting that true greatness which is satisfied with the reality of power, and which will not exhaust itself in keeping up needless appearances.

A standing army then, is a crying evil: so is a body of police: so are courts of justice. But it is a greater evil that a peaceable nation should be crushed by an aggressive one, that rogues should oppress honest men, that criminals should go unpunished. It is an evil too that we should have physicians and lawyers: but it is a greater evil that disease should run riot, and property be endangered; and without medical men and gentlemen of the robe, our bodies and our estates would be insecure.

Nor is Fourier the first or only person who ever felt for the poor. It was nothing new even forty or fifty years ago, to sympathise with the afflicted, to visit the fatherless, to adopt the deserted orphan. It was not by Fourier that the philanthropic Howard was moved to perform his long continued journeys of mercy: Mrs. Fry, in her feats of prison benevolence, did not derive her inspiration from Fourier. Long before his time, denunciations were uttered against men who by grinding the poor, added field to field, and congratulating themselves on their ill-gotten stores, forgot that that night their souls might be required of them.

On the facts, that these things are and that they are

very grievous, all thinking men are agreed : the question is as to the remedy. How shall the vices of society be corrected : how shall the old sores be healed ? Here, most men will be entirely at issue with Fourier. We are told by his expositor : " Unity is the divine destiny of human societies : it is only by this that they can be harmonised with creation. Fourier's genius embraces this unity ; subject to the law of movement, he cannot create it at a stroke ; but he gives it a corner-stone as a base, and this is the phalanstère or commune. Fourier's system is nothing more than a new organization of the commune.

" The commune is already a happy element in civilization. It is by dividing and subdividing a kingdom into provinces, counties, departments, communes, that a centralized government has been created and unity conferred ; but this unity is only apparent. The commune which ought to be everything in the State, since it forms the constituent element, is, properly speaking, only a fiction. The State remains none the less composed of squalid and poverty-stricken villages, of towns more or less large, and of a monstrous capital, a vampire that swallows the blood and substance of the rest of the kingdom ; which engrosses the richest productions of industry, monopolises the fine arts and intelligence, to furnish as a result, a slough and common sewer of every vice and corruption united.

" The commune, as Fourier understands it, is to be at once the whole and a part, the centre and the extremity ; it is to offer the image of a little society and of a great

family perfectly organized; it is to have an interior existence complete in itself; and to unite itself to other communes by ties of exchange and of reciprocal services, such as will not permit the one to predominate over the other, to make an unfair use of it, or to crush it."

But Fourier differs greatly from many communists in one respect. He does not propose that all shall work for all, and that there shall be a perfect community of goods without regard to the capacities of each member. "Fourier's whole system is based on differences and inequalities, natural and social. In nature no two things are alike; everything has a resemblance but a difference: in mankind as in all creation, the organization, physical, moral, and intellectual, differs in each individual by shades which touch, blend, are graduated, and differ. We cannot therefore, introduce into society an inequality incompatible with the development of the faculties, the will, and the desires. We ought on the contrary to believe, and Fourier proves it beyond a doubt, that in an order prudently arranged, the natural and social inequalities that follow will be the surest pledges of concord and harmony."

Such then, are Fourier's principles. He proposes to adopt a sort of communism, so far as to get rid of all the loss attending on the splitting up of society into private families; yet he refuses to adopt that levelling community of goods which is the dream of some enthusiasts, but which Fourier saw to be quite inconsistent with the nature of man. Before I proceed to exhibit the details of the project, I will explain what

results were anticipated by its author; how far he hoped to get rid of the evils he denounced; and what degree of happiness he anticipated for mankind. The reader must be prepared for rather startling prognostications.

“Fourier’s doctrine is not limited in its application, to one race of men and to one part of the globe, but embraces all races and the whole earth: it founds unity, it abolishes slavery, every servile employment, every forced service; it secures to everyone, wealth, well-being, complete developement of the faculties; it gives a double guarantee to property, first of the principal, then of the revenue; whilst it comes to the aid of the wretched, it increases indefinitely the fortune and pleasure of the wealthy; from the passions themselves it draws concord; it establishes throughout the world a uniformity of measures, language, manners, labours, and administration; it extinguishes all contagion by general quarantine; it reforms the climates and brings to perfection all the products of the earth and all the races of animals, by universal cultivation; it makes this world an enchanting habitation, realising the virtues of the golden age, uniting to them the enjoyments of luxury, the unlimited development of arts, sciences, and industry; finally it consoles man in death by the certainty of immortality, and the transmigration of souls in this world and in all the planets that occupy the universe.”

Wonderful promises! but confirmed by other particulars equally worthy of our admiration. “In this

new social organization, it is no longer the commune which is a fiction; it is the provinces, kingdoms, states, which are fictitious; since they represent only a certain number of communes, and there exist on the earth only phalanstères or communes. The springs of administration, free from shocks and revolutions, are singularly modified and simplified; every commune, managing its own affairs, has no relation with the general administration either of the kingdom or of the globe, except to pay with regularity and in gross, its taxes or share of the public expenditure, and to send deputies to the assemblies of provinces, of kingdoms, of the earth's capital." It is added that according to Fourier, Constantinople would become that capital.

"The destructive and immoral preponderance of the present capitals will cease, as well as the danger of an anarchical system of federation. The earth throughout will be equally peopled: no more will be seen populations crowded at one point, with vast fields by their side destitute of inhabitants: no more, a few flourishing countries and three-fourths of the globe desert, uncultivated, abandoned to wild beasts and a few barbarous nations or nomade hordes. National hatreds will be extinguished in the regular division of the communes, which giving to each the first ties of a great family, of a little country, will open the soul to the love of the great social family of the human race. The commune is the pivot of social unity. The sovereign of the world will be unable to establish unity except by the formation of the commune."

One extraordinary result of this great harmony will be that all will be contented with their lot; a state of things which will be almost a distressing well-being to us grumbling Englishmen, who are supposed to place a considerable share of our happiness in the possession of a good grievance. What would become of our farmers if the weather ceased to harass them? How would they expend their superfluous energy? In singing and dancing at their work?

“Besides, how could there be complaint or remonstrance? If every one belonged to a single group, he would be led to exclusively espouse its interests, and from this exclusive spirit discord would undoubtedly arise; but as every one belongs to perhaps thirty groups, all of them with a common interest, every individual necessarily espouses the interests of the commune; and if one group thinks itself injured, the individuals who compose it are easily pacified, since the injury done to one group is for the advantage of the others, in the profits of which the same individuals have a share. The entire association of occupations so mixes up the interests of each with the interests of all, that no one can be damaged, and that all share in the general profits and losses.”

A very gratifying part of the system is the improvement which it will effect in the education, the morals, and even in the manners of all the members. Indeed if it can perform its promises in these respects, it may even do all the rest. The great problem of actual life is to improve the individual members of society. Make

all men sober, just, industrious, and good tempered, and you have a millennium. Fourier's system is not wanted in that case, nor is any other system. Government would be almost dispensed with. All this, Fourier will effect.

"In the present state of things, there is a threefold separation between classes; inequality of birth and fortune, education, and the prejudices that decri certain avocations. People of cultivated mind and polished manners, putting aside all prejudices of birth and fortune, cannot associate with workmen who are uncultivated and rough, and still less with domestics who are usually corrupted by their position. In the commune, all the children receiving an education exactly the same, that is, the education most favourable to the development of their faculties, aptitudes, and vocations, will have cultivated minds and polished manners. After the first generation under this system, all inequality of education will have disappeared, at the same time that all avocations will be equally respected. As to inequality of fortune, that will weigh little from the time that every one will possess the means of living and even affluence."

Some persons however, would be ill satisfied with a life of mere enjoyment. To young and active men nothing is more repugnant than repose. To them, mere existence even with all the gratifications of sense, has no charms; and they sigh for difficulties to surmount and almost for hardships to endure. Fourier has not overlooked such men. In his system, "A magnificent

career is open to all active tempers; it is at once the aim, the recompense, and the complement of primary education. This career is that of the industrial armies, which to the extent of hundreds of thousands, are to overflow the whole world, to cultivate, fertilize, and embellish it; and to effect as by enchantment, astonishing labours such as the present day dreams not of. The substitution of industrial armies for armies of devastation, is one of the finest parts of Fourier's conception, and the one which affords the widest field to the imagination as to the material future of the earth."

Fourier himself says on this gorgeous fancy: "The industrial armies will be formed at the foundation of my system, because the youth brought up in *civilization*," (as opposed to his *harmony*) "will feel great inclination to military reunions; and because, not having been formed to harmonian agriculture, they will adopt it less willingly than others trained to it from infancy; they will rush more eagerly to grand and brilliant reunions. These motives will impel them to these industrial armies from the very commencement of association.

"1st. The campaign will be passed in diversions as much as in labours: there will be great occupations, varied by immense fêtes, tending to the progress of industry. The labours are executed by groups and series, changed every two hours, as those of the commune.

"2ndly. No one will suffer from the weather. Every

detachment is sheltered in its work by good tents, is lodged in the cellular camps of the neighbouring communes, conveyed in carriages each morning to the place of work, and similarly brought back every evening.

“3rdly. Promotion is secured to merit.

“Allurements of every kind are not wanting, to draw men to the industrial armies: they will be far more numerous than armies of devastation. I reckon that for the attack on the *Sahara*, or great desert, it will be needful to maintain a body of four millions of men during forty years, with six or eight months of work every year. This army will busy itself in planting trees from one post to another, in order to restore the springs, in order to moisten and gradually solidify the sands, and step by step ameliorate the climate.”

Many other advantages are to be secured to men: these among the rest. “The King of France has not even a portico to shelter him from the weather as he enters his carriage: how much greater the poverty of the plebeian, who in the army must bivouac on the snow or in the mud; whilst in the societary state, he works in the open air only during fair weather; and finds at every point of the province, *belvideres* and *kiosques*, in which are kept tents and clothes, and to which are brought at the end of the work-time of an hour and a half or two hours, refreshments, and carriages if it rains.

“The same peasant who is now obliged to carry his sabots in his hand to save them (the habit of the peasants of *la belle France* where the labourer who has

not even a garret, is reduced like the lazzaroné of Naples, to lie down in the road,) will have, *in harmony*, gratuitous admission into the carriages of the lowest class on all the roads of the globe, besides a bed and admission to the lowest tables and use of clothes in all the communes; for the harmonians will everywhere exercise hospitality. The poorest of the harmonians will have the command of eight hundred thousand palaces far more agreeable than those of Paris or Rome, in which there are not found a quarter of the conveniences that a phalanstère will combine."

Children also will come in for a share of the brilliant novelties promised. They will have a new enjoyment in the way of riding, an amusement that particularly delights them. "Association has the advantage of domesticating many species at present untamed; as the beaver and the zebra: thus the wool of the beaver and the lama will be as plentiful as that of merinos is at present. Beavers will build their houses in palisaded valleys. Zebras, allured, not broken, by modes now impracticable, will be docile enough to be ridden by children of ten or twelve years, forming squadrons of small cavalry, (a powerful stimulant to emulation at this age). The zebra and the quagga, excellent for burden, superior to the horse in speed, equal to the ass in vigour, are a conquest impossible to civilization: even if it knew the mode of taming them, it could not use it, because it is deficient in every thing that the instinct of these quadrupeds requires."

I will mention one more advantage proposed; an

advantage that will be estimated by most men at a higher rate than perpetual variety of labour, than a constant round of singing and dancing, than a never-failing opportunity of travelling without the hardships which now attend it, than even the certainty of having a carriage always in waiting in case of a shower. With all the uneasiness of which we constantly complain, most of us shrink from death. Boldly as we face the monster at the instigation of passion, at the call of affection, or even at the claim of duty, in cold blood we dread his approaches. We read with pleasure of men who have lived long, have retained their faculties, and have died at last of exhaustion rather than disease: and we are willing to believe that, bating accidents, we may ourselves with temperance and exercise spin out our lives to the same dreary length, and outlive our enjoyments, our senses, our friends. By all means then, let us assist in establishing a phalanstère; for "In supposing unity and harmony on the globe, integral education or a development physical moral and intellectual carried to the highest degree, secured to every individual, all enjoying vigour, health, and wealth, all the races of the earth intermarrying and improving; who shall set bounds to the future vigour and longevity of the human race, any more than to the felicity it will enjoy in this state of things?"

"Fourier assigns one hundred and forty-four years as the mean duration of life in the harmonian state:" a term more than three times [as long as the one that now prevails. Men therefore, under this delightful

régime, will hope for a life, not of seventy or eighty years, but of two or three hundred years. Infatuated world, to hesitate about adopting such a system !

SECTION III.—Details of the plan—A proposed commune or phalange—A square league of ground—1,800 persons—Habitation in common—Explanation of words phalange, phalanstère, série—Alleged pecuniary profit—Particular arrangements—Motives to labour—Three new passions discovered—Insufficiency to secure regular labour—Partial remedy in devotedness—Change of occupation every two hours—Remuneration of capital, labour, and talent—Frugality of phalanstère—But what obtained?—Absence of domestic servants absurd in practice—Actual evil of men-servants—Nursery proposed—Sexual relations—Instruction voluntary—Opera as amusement.

In my last section I stated what were the results which Fourier intended to accomplish: I propose now to explain the means by which these numerous advantages were to be obtained. The extinction of poverty, the multiplication of the enjoyments of the rich, the perfect education and refinement of all classes, the peopling of the whole world without any fear of overcrowding, the subjugation of howling wildernesses and of wild beasts hitherto untameable, the union of the whole world in perfect amity, the creation of a zebra corps, and the extension of the life of man to three times its present length, are wonders that must needs require some very powerful and extraordinary agents to effect them.

Madame Gatti de Gamond introduces her readers very early to a general notion of Fourier's plan. "This

social mechanism may be realized simply and easily, and offers immediate advantages: it requires for an experiment only a square league of ground, and four hundred families, or about eighteen hundred persons, associated in one habitation, with common interests and labours. An association of this kind would afford such a spectacle of well being and happiness, that the whole of society would soon constitute itself on a similar base, and this example would be followed by all the nations of the earth." I must remark that it is easy to speak lightly of a square league of ground, as though it were a trifle; and so it is in the United States, where land may be bought at five shillings an acre: but in France, where every fertile corner is carefully cultivated, it would be no easy matter to find a square league all in one lot. Four or five thousand acres form a large farm, and would in most parts of France be the property of scores or hundreds of families. In England it would be easy enough to meet with such a quantity of land the property of one person; but it would be a formidable speculation to lay out 150,000*l.* or 200,000*l.* for such a purchase; and a square league of pretty good land would hardly be got for less.

Elsewhere we are told that the law of association "establishes the unity of the globe by its regular division into communes, consisting of 1,500 to 1,800 persons, uniting themselves as to political or general interests, by means of elections, to a congressional hierarchy, representing successively an increasing number of communes, up to the congress of spherical unity,

deliberating in the name of the whole earth." But since this mighty plan cannot be accomplished at once; since we can hardly hope that the self-willed Englishman, the sturdy Swiss, the supple Hindoo, the savage Malay, the laughing negro, and the sombre copper-coloured Indian, should at a stroke be induced to surrender their national prejudices; since even in France men were found stupid enough to procrastinate in adopting this scheme of perfect happiness, clinging fondly to their homesteads and their families, and disregarding Fourier's unquestionable demonstrations of their folly; for these reasons it would be necessary to begin with one commune first, and thus to set that example which men beholding would inevitably follow.

"Let us suppose then, that as an attempt at grand harmony, there is obtained a square league of ground, on which must be raised a large habitation common to four hundred families or about eighteen hundred persons, of differing aptitudes and specialities, of fortunes unequal but as far as possible graduated. The whole system of Fourier is founded on natural and social differences and inequalities. . . . Every family, or properly speaking, every individual, man woman, child or old man, brings his share of capital, labour, or talent, all or one of them. The phalange (or commune) advances to one who brings only labour, the *minimum*, food, lodgings, clothes, of the third class; for there are lodgings of various sizes, and three kinds of tables, for the different fortunes. The phalange is reimbursed these advances at the end of the year, when

a general distribution of the produce takes place. A minimum is secured to every labourer. Every one in a short time, shares to some extent, in the annual distribution according to all the three faculties of capital, labour, and talent; since in the second year, even those who originally brought only their labour, may now have some savings to invest; and since every one, undertaking a number of different employments, as explained elsewhere, may exhibit talent in one or other branch. Even children of three or four years old may already reimburse the minimum 'advance and effect some savings, which will secure them a capital constantly increasing; they may also, by distinguishing themselves in the employments assigned them, share in the remuneration of talent. Old men who have previously lived in the *phalanstère*, will find when their strength decays and their remuneration as labourers diminishes, that their income from capital has increased in consequence of the enlargement of their accumulations, and that their remuneration for talent is augmented on account of their long practice and experience. Children under four or five years old will be maintained at the expense of the phalange; as will be the sick and infirm. As to idlers, it is certain that none such will be found whether poor or rich, in this societary system."

It will be observed that I have used the original words, *phalange* and *phalanstère*. *Phalange* means simply phalanx, and was adopted I suppose by Fourier, to indicate the strength that would be gained in a social

point of view by the adoption of this close industrial array. Men standing shoulder to shoulder in the battle of life, would resist industrial and financial difficulties, as the Macedonians of old in their serried ranks, beat off their enemies. *Phalanstère* is not to be found in the orthodox dictionaries. Academicians decline to sanction such a barbarous introduction. The passage above, shows that it is used to indicate the habitation of the phalanx. We shall find afterwards, that the word *série* is used for a group or series of groups; and that *séristère*, another uncouth derivative, means the place in which the groups laboured. Fourier is said by his admirer, to have got rid of all social difficulties, by "*Attractive labour, or the theory of passionate groups and series.*"

I have not observed any explanation of the reason for choosing 1,800 persons as the number for a phalanx. Perhaps no better ground could be assigned than this: that Fourier fixed on a square league as a convenient unity of space, and that he then calculated how many persons that quantity of ground would maintain. One is naturally led to compare this limit with Plato's 5,040 husbandmen, each with a portion of land. This number is more than twelve times as great as Fourier's 400, but the whole intent is quite different. Plato pitched on the particular number rather than the round 5,000, because 5,040 is divisible by 2, 3, &c., up to 10; and excepting 11, by 2, 3, &c., up to 12. Before Arabic notation was used, this divisibility was of great consequence, as any one who will attempt to perform even a simple sum with Roman figures, will perceive. When

a person has had to divide xcix by xxviii without using our ordinary notation, he will cease to wonder at Plato's precision.

It is not difficult to understand what are the advantages proposed by inducing men to live together instead of each inhabiting a separate house; or to work together instead of each carrying on his separate trade. "There exist" says Fourier, "only two methods of exercising industry: viz., separate culture by isolated families, such as we see it, or the societary state, culture in numerous reunions which have a fixed rule for fair distribution to each, according to the three industrial faculties, capital, labour, and talent.

"Association is already introduced into some trifling details of rural industry, as the parish oven. A village of a hundred families perceives that if it were necessary to build, repair, and heat a hundred ovens, it would cost in masonry, fuel, and manipulation, ten times as much as the common oven costs: and the economy would amount to twenty or thirty times as much if the neighbourhood consisted of 200 or 300 families.

"It follows that if association is applied to all the details of domestic and rural life, there will be found a medium saving of nine-tenths of the whole expense, besides the produce obtained by the labour of the hands saved and used in other employments."

This last remark deserves to be considered. Let us imagine a village of a hundred families, with an oven to each: and a second village of the same number of families with one oven for all, if we can suppose that

one oven might, as Fourier assumes, serve for so many. Let us say, for the sake of illustration, that the repairs and occasional reconstruction of the hundred ovens in the first village, together with the brick and iron for materials and the cutting fuel, required the constant services of five families; while the public oven of the second village, though constantly in use, was kept in order by the labour of one family half its time, or for the sake of simplicity, of one family all its time. In this second village, as compared with the first, there would be four families unemployed. The bread consumers would be supplied with their baking in the second village, at a less cost than in the first village, to the extent of the labour of four families. The ninety-five householders might employ these four families in any other way, and they would pay the four families with the savings in baking by one oven instead of by a hundred. They might have them constantly at work improving and repairing their houses, or in renovating their wells, or in building a church and a school-house. But Fourier says that there is a double gam; first to the ninety-five villagers of four-fifths of the cost of baking, secondly to some one else of the products of the four masons' labour. There could not be a more decided fallacy, and in another instance I think a similar fallacy may be found in Fourier's reasoning.

It is perfectly true that, if not in a village yet in a town, a great miller will grind and bake as much bread as is consumed not merely by a hundred, but by twenty thousand persons: and that the saving may be as great

as Fourier represents it. But it would be extremely incorrect to suppose that all private domestic arrangements could be superseded with equal profit. Cooking generally may be done cheaper on a large scale than on a small one. But shall we say the same of sewing? Could a sempstress who is employed at home by ten persons, do ten times as much as she would if employed by one person? So of servants: if ten families each with three servants removed to one large house, each having their separate parlours and bed-rooms, would they be as well waited on by three servants for the whole, as they are now with three for each? The fallacy consists in fixing on the particular item of baking, and transferring its peculiarities to all other matters of domestic arrangement.

But all the proposed advantages of the harmonian state are to arise from increased economy and increased productiveness. A parish oven will save nine-tenths of the expense of baking. In the phalanstère, the four hundred families will save nineteen-twentieths of the expense of baking: *i.e.*, if each had its own oven before, an assumption by no means to be granted. It is further assumed that labour of every kind will be increased in productiveness in a proportion something like that of labour in baking. Most labourers however are not employed in domestic services, but in agriculture or manufactures. I see nothing in the proposed organization of the phalanstère that tends to increase the productiveness of labour in either of these departments. Labour might be rendered more amusing if a man after

ploughing two hours, then went to shoe-making or gardening; but it is contrary to the very principle of the division of labours to suppose, that by this change of occupation labour would be rendered more productive. It might be very well for health that people should not go out to work when it rained; but we can hardly allow that the periodical produce would be increased by such fair-weather service.

Then again as to manufactures. The productiveness of labour in these depends especially on the subdivision of labours. But this subdivision takes place to a wonderful extent in civilization (as Fourier calls our present state). Would the phalange be provided with larger capitals, and manufacture on a more extensive scale, than we find in civilization? How could a sufficient number of hands be found for such extensive works, among the four hundred families, who must supply agricultural labourers as well as mechanics? to say nothing of the drafts to be made on each for the four millions of industrial soldiers who are to subdue the Sahara by forty years' labour. There are to be no idlers it is said; but on the other hand there is to be all the waste and profusion characteristic of concerns managed without the constant care arising from private interest. It would be a marvellous thing if the four hundred families constituting a phalange, found their labour even as productive as that of four hundred families taken at random in a state of civilization; and any increase is quite out of the question.

But let us come to particulars. For with regard to

these, Fourier differs greatly from St. Simon, who gave but a rough sketch as a dying bequest, and left his disciples to quarrel out the particulars. Fourier by long study and elaborate calculation, reduced his notions to a very definite plan. Having obtained a square league of ground, he would erect on it, in the centre I suppose, a large building to hold his four hundred families.

"The centre of the building should be set apart for the quiet occupations; for refectories, counting-house, council-rooms, libraries, studies, &c. Here are placed the temple, the *tour d'ordre*, the telegraph, the carrier pigeons, the visitors' bell, the observatory, the winter court furnished with reservoirs, plants, and placed behind the parade court.

"One of the wings must contain all the noisy trades, the carpenters, the forge; also the children's trades, generally very noisy.

"The other wing must contain the caravanseraï with ball-rooms and strangers' reception rooms, in order that these may not block up the centre of the palace and hinder the domestic occupations of the phalange.

"The phalanstère, besides the individual apartments, ought to have many halls for public receptions: they should be called *séristères*, or places for meeting and developing passional series.

"Care will be taken to have small rooms near the dining-room for groups who object to the public table.

"In every arrangement, there is a provision of small rooms by the side of the *séristères*, for small reunions.

"The farm-offices, granaries and store-houses, should

be placed if possible, opposite the palace. The space between them and the palace will serve as a court of honour or a yard for *manœuvre*.

"Behind the centre of the palace, the lateral fronts of the two wings should be prolonged to obtain and to inclose a grand winter court, forming a garden and promenade furnished with resinous evergreen plants; this promenade must be placed in a covered court shut out from the country

"The gardens should be placed as much as possible, behind the palace and not behind the out-buildings, the neighbourhood of which should be kept for farming.

"The palace should be pierced at intervals, like the gallery of the Louvre, by carriage entrances

"The palace has no exterior walk exposed to the severity of the weather; all parts of the building may be reached by a great gallery which runs along every floor

"It is well to give eight *toises* of thickness to the principal building, in order to obtain in the two rows of rooms, recesses and closets, which save much building; for a deep recess of eight feet furnished with a closet, is as good as a room. The minimum of room for the poorest class, is a room with a recess and a closet for each.

"(This is in a phalanstère of full harmony: in simple harmony, a cell is sufficient for each villager or labourer.)"

We may understand by these extracts, what were Fourier's notions as to the means of lodging and feeding

his harmonians, the inhabitants of his palatial phalanstère. We have a plot of ground of 4,000 to 5,000 acres, with an ornamental *union* situated in the centre of it: a large dining hall with a cluster of rooms around it for those who could afford to take their meals in smaller parties; large workshops or factories for carrying on trades: suites of rooms for those who could afford them, with inferior accommodation for the poorer classes. The farming was to be done only in fine weather; and in case of sudden rain, carriages were to be despatched to fetch home the tenderly nurtured hedgers and ditchers. The great question that presses next, is, how men and women so well provided with the means of living, would be induced to labour regularly: and without regular and sustained labour, the means for all these indulgences would certainly be wanting. Fourier professed to have investigated with scientific precision, the motives by which men were induced to work. The results of his inquiries are very characteristic, and must be given as nearly as possible in his own words and those of his expositor.

“Fourier distinguishes twelve primitive passions which stimulate men to work, which render him sociable, which move him to noble actions and produce all the marvels of industry. The first five are the sensitive, of which our senses are the primary organs: they are material rather than spiritual, and stimulate man in the first place to industry. Four other passions are, love, friendship, ambition, *familism*; spiritual rather than material; forming all the social ties that exist, leading

men to live rather in his kind than in himself, producing devotedness, self-abnegation, and all the generous sentiments.

Three other passions discovered by Fourier, will rather surprise Englishmen accustomed to read treatises on human nature: and such persons may suspect these passions are either novelties to be produced by the strange phalansterian life, or passions peculiar to the French race. These three are, "the *butterflyish*, the *cabalistic*, the *composite*; of which the effects are little observed in civilization; for they are destined to conciliate the five sensuous springs with the five springs of affection; and to serve as a base for the whole mechanism of passionate groups and series.

"The butterflyish is the need of periodical variety; contrasted situations; changes of scene; piquant incidents; novelties fit to create illusion, and to stimulate at once the senses and the soul.

"Thus necessity is felt moderately from hour to hour, and strongly at intervals of two hours; if it is unsatisfied men feel tedium and ennui. Every enjoyment long continued becomes an abuse, blunts the organs, exhausts enjoyment: a meal continued four hours cannot end without excess; an opera of four hours wears out the audience.

"In industry, the alternation of employments is equally necessary: health is inevitably injured if a man applies himself twelve hours to an unvaried occupation; weaving, sewing, writing, or any other which fails to call into play all parts of the body. In this case injury

ensues, even by active farm labour just as by sedentary employment; the one overworks the limbs and viscera, the other harms the solids and fluids.

“The case is worse if the labour is continued during months or years. Thus in certain countries, one eighth of the working population is afflicted with hernia, besides the fevers caused by excess or by insufficient nutriment. Many manufactures of chemical substances, of glass and even of woven fabrics, are murderous to the workmen, merely by the continuity of labour; the danger would cease if the employment were prolonged only two hours at a time, twice or thrice a week.

“The butterfly passion is a necessity of soul and body, of the whole nature. Races have need of alternation by variety of crossing; wanting these they deteriorate. Soils in the same way require a rotation of crops and even of grain; for wheat will not succeed on land where it has lately grown; the neighbouring field suits it better. Men’s stomachs equally require variety: a change of dishes sharpens appetite and aids digestion. Body and soul demand alternation whether of pleasure or occupations.

“The *cabalistic* and the *composite* are perfectly contrasted: the former is a speculative and reflective enthusiasm; the latter is a blind enthusiasm, a state of intoxication, of delirium which arises from the simultaneous enjoyment of many sensuous and mental pleasures.

“The *cabalistic*, or spirit of party, is to the human soul a necessity so imperious, that in default of real intrigues, factitious ones are eagerly sought, as gambling,

theatrical amusements, or romances. If you assemble a company, you must furnish it with an artificial intrigue, by offering a game of cards, or inventing an electoral intrigue. Nothing is less happy than a courtier exiled into the provinces, into a little trading town without intrigue. A tradesman retired from business, and suddenly removed from the mercantile cabals which are numerous and active, is, notwithstanding his fortune, the most miserable of men.

"The principal property of the cabalistic passion in my machinery of series, is to excite discords or emulous competitions between the groups, of a sort sufficiently alike to dispute the palm and balance the votes.

"The composite passion springs from a combination of many pleasures of sense and of soul, enjoyed at the same moment; it creates enthusiasm or a blind earnestness in believers, the reverse of the reflective enthusiasm of the cabalistic. It is necessary that these two passions should be applied to all societary labours; that the composite and the cabalistic should replace the sordid motives which are felt in civilized industry, the need of maintaining children, the fear of dying of hunger, or of being locked up for begging.

"These three passions commonly entitled vices, although every one is under their influence, are really sources of vice in civilization, where they can act only on families or corporations; God has created them to act on series of contrasted groups; they tend only to form this order, and cannot fail to cause evil if used in a different order."

Such were Fourier's notions of the passions by acting on which men may, as he conceived, be induced to labour regularly. We have already seen that he proposed to make work attractive, instead of being repulsive as it is among us civilized people. His mode of accomplishing this was to form the labourers into groups and series of groups, relieving each other every two hours; each group undertaking in succession a great number of occupations, by means of the division of labours. So delightful was it considered that work would become under these new arrangements, that people would like their regular tasks better than the sport of shooting; and so far was this to be carried that game was expected to increase to such a degree that it would become necessary to destroy it in self-defence.

It is acknowledged that this attractiveness of labour was necessary to the success of the whole plan. For as people were all of them to be fed, clothed and lodged, the motives that now drive most men to work, would be removed, and people would be apt to fall into idleness and apathy. But if work could be made more pleasant than amusement is at present, if to make a shoe came to be deemed more agreeable than to drive a billiard ball, to mow a field more entertaining than to play at cricket, to turn a furrow more exciting than to shoot a bird, the problem would be solved. Men would work, not for the sake of the produce, but for the mere pleasure of working.

Another advantage would follow from this newly invented attractiveness of work. Not only would all

the towns and villages around, rush into an adoption of this system, which would relieve them from the dislike to labour: but besides this, the savages of the world would be allured by this pleasing example. "This alone will attract and reclaim six hundred millions of barbarians; for they have hitherto remained rebels to civilization with its repulsive labours, and its array-of policemen, sbirri, gaolers, and executioners; but they will be easily enticed and allured by this picture of liberty and happiness."

"Men, however, will be attracted to work by other means. Not only will the labours be lightened by being carried on in groups, with singing and dancing, and with an agreeable rivalry between one group and another: but men also will choose their own occupations, and will of course select those which they find pleasant. At the end of one of the labours of two hours, the members of a group will go to other work as each of them is disposed; one to the poultry yard, another to the dovecote, a third to the kitchens, a fourth to the greenhouses, a fifth to the workshops. . . . All the reunions are good-humoured, because they consist of free members who have volunteered for the particular service."

It might be objected by one who is only a civilized man, not an harmonian, and therefore not worthy of much attention; that some of the occupations would be overdone with hands while others might be neglected. In a fine day of summer, with a soft breeze and delicious odours of flowers and the soothing sound of a distant waterfall, with every sensuous gratification which the

garden of a phalansterian palace would afford, people might be excused if they preferred tending the flowers to sweltering in a hot kitchen: and disguise it how you may, victuals cannot be cooked without heat. How inconvenient if the group of cooks, having concluded their two hours' task at eleven o'clock, left their fires and stewpans, and rushed together to tie up flowers or adorn a cool grotto: and if no other members selected the repulsive task of going on with the dinner! How trying to the tempers of this temple of Epicurus, if at the dinner-hour it were found that the soups were tasteless and the meats burnt or sodden! I fear the spontaneous system would be out of credit for that day, and that there would be mutterings about the superiority of paid cooks. In the spring, when damps are succeeded by east winds even in *La belle France*, there would naturally be a rush to indoor employments; to the workshops and kitchens: the farms and gardens would be neglected; the flowers of the succeeding summer would fail from want of previous attention, and the autumn crops would be deficient. Paid gardeners and paid farm labourers would become objects of desire.

Then again, certain groups would naturally form themselves around seductive persons. The prettiest girls and the most jovial men would attract all their companions. The coquetry of a beauty, or the whim of a wit, would disturb the balance of the labours of a day; to say nothing of rivalries and heartburnings, of a friend's sulks or a lover's jealousies. This playing at duty would be grievously heavy work.

To remedy the extremest of these evils, Fourier has a notion peculiarly his own. He could not shut his eyes to the fact, that some employments are in themselves so distasteful or disgusting, that they would never be chosen spontaneously; and that therefore, these would be entirely neglected unless some special provision were made for them. No one would wish to act the scavenger, or to load dung-carts, or to clear out pig-styes, or even to scrub a dirty room, or wash foul linen. How are these essential and daily-recurring services to be secured?

We are told that “a more powerful motive will actuate the labourers: this motive will be *devotedness*, a passion innate in all generous natures. Even in our present egotistical society, we constantly behold examples of devotedness and self-forgetfulness: it may even be affirmed that there is more often wanting the opportunity than the faculty or disposition to devotedness. Among women, most errors as mothers, as lovers, as wives, proceed from a blind self-sacrifice which does not know where to stop, or which is deceived as to its object. Among men, most political errors proceed from the necessity of patriotism. The ancients had a country, factitious indeed and independent of the laws of humanity, but still they had an idol to which they sacrificed all their existence, drop by drop. Moderns have no country. The soul perishes, consumed by this passion which wants its element. All revolutions have for their aim, unwittingly even to their authors, to create a country, a general interest, a commonweal,

as an object of general attachment. Humanity has not as its destiny an egotism which eats into it and destroys it. Family and country: these are the two sentiments the dearest to men, of which they have need as the object of life, to confound together in the same love and devotedness. The societary state unites family and country, and gives a man a distinct object of devotedness in the prosperity of the phalange whose interests are his own, and which attaches him to the great chain of humanity by family and country."

The whole of this passage seems to me to be full of glorious confusion. That men, and still more women, are capable of self-sacrifice, is undoubted. Far from us be that miserable philosophy which makes the most generous actions only a refined kind of selfishness: which confounds together the man who ruins another for the amusement of a day, and the Howard who incurs fatigue and expense and danger, who gives up ease, pleasure, social intercourse, that he may relieve the lowest of his species. There is in human nature a capability of devotedness, without a thought of present gratification or future reward.

But this capacity is spoken of by our author, as though it were similar to bodily hunger and thirst, or love of mental excitement. A hungry man, if he cannot get bread and meat, will eat potatoes; or failing those, he will eat nettles, seaweed, garbage. A man deprived of an honest employment by a sufficient provision for his wants, is eaten up by the necessity of doing, and resorts to the billiard-table, to the turf, to

cards. Or he takes to political life, to travelling, to anything that may furnish excitement. Madame Gatti de Gamond regards devotedness as being in the same category. Men and women must have some object of self-sacrifice, she thinks : and wanting the ordinary objects will resort to others that we put before them. If they cannot practise self-sacrifice on family and country, they will practise it on their own phalanstère : if they cannot give up their days to working for their family, or hazard their lives in fighting for their country, they will exercise this passion in performing unpalatable employments, in cleaning out pig-styes or playing the washerwoman.

I cannot say that my experience confirms this view. I have not found men apparently going about with a stock of unemployed devotedness, in search of objects on which to lavish it. Since the death of Don Quixote I fear this amiable character of self-sacrifice has been lost to the world. A railway porter near Liverpool some years ago, seeing a child in danger from an approaching train, rushed on to the line, and was crushed under the engine. Here was an act of true self-devotion. The porter's sympathy for the child and its friends, was vehemently excited ; he disregarded the danger to himself though he knew perfectly what was the risk he ran. He would have experienced no such lively desire to save a cur or a lamb, and his sense of personal danger would have held him back from the attempt to rescue such an animal. Now I do not conceive of this noble man as of one going about

with an unsatisfied desire for self-devotion: I regard him as one with a kind heart and a keen sympathy with his fellows: the self-sacrifice I look upon, not as the exercise of a peculiar passion, but as the effect of the predominance of sympathy over the instinct of self-preservation.

So, if a mother nurses her sick child day and night, until her own health gives way, this is the result, I think, of the tender solicitude of the mother prevailing over the sense of fatigue and weariness, and is not the result of any particular passion of devotedness, which regards the offspring as a suitable object for its exercise.

If M. Fourier's phalanstérians were to be moved to clean out pig-styes and wash dirty linen by a desire to gratify a passion of self-devotion, I fear that those unamiable occupations would be greatly neglected. A sense of duty might be a prevailing motive in our state of civilization which Fourier spits upon: a sense of justice might occur to our backward minds, and might lead us to reflect that as a matter of fairness we should take our share of menial and offensive occupations; but anything so old-fashioned as justice, finds little favour in the harmonian state. Men are to be actuated by affection and passion, and by these alone.

It is confessed, however, that something more is necessary. Fourier saw that however much he might talk about self-devotion, men would not commonly be actuated by it; and therefore he proposed to use a more homely, but for everyday life a more serviceable

motive ; self-interest. After laying down the proportions in which the periodical produce of the phalanstère was to be divided among the members, according to their capital, labour, and talent, he assigns different degrees of reward to labour according to its pleasantness or repulsiveness. "The groups employed in the orchards must be remunerated less than those employed in cultivating grain ; although the culture of fruits is equally productive : but, in harmony, the cultivation of orchards is very attractive ; it is unnecessary to strengthen this series by the inducement of rewards.

"On the contrary, it is necessary to reward liberally the series for raising grain, which implies more fatigue. The same rule holds in the case of metals, of repairing the roads, of cleaning rooms, of emptying cesspools ; all these employments, though infinitely less disgusting than they are at present, and though varied by more pleasing employments at intervals of two hours, must be well paid to counterbalance their offensiveness."

Throughout all these arrangements we find a constant reference to the change of occupation every two hours, and this part of the scheme is evidently a favourite of Fourier's. I do not deny that in certain cases such a change would be very desirable, nor that in many avocations of the present day there is a painful want of variety. Writing-clerks generally are sufferers from monotony : so must be all mechanics employed in simple processes, such as prevail generally where high class machinery is used ; though mechanics who work without such machinery, and who are called on for the

exercise of much skill, have very often far more variety of occupations. It is a great drawback from the boasted advantages of spinning-jennies and power-looms and many others of the greatest inventions, that they supersede skilful artizans, and multiply the mere human machines, the dull labourers with hands and no head. The world has far more clothes to wear than it would otherwise have, but the population of the manufacturing towns is greatly deteriorated by the change. Manchester contains a certain number of machinists of wonderful skill; many carpenters and masons and other workmen with the same skill that such men have elsewhere: but besides these, it has scores of thousands of unskilled labourers who did not need to serve any apprenticeship to their trade, and who are badly paid because any country-fellow can come and soon learn all that is required. In all the inferior employments there is of course great monotony, which Fourier's plan, if it were at all practicable, would greatly relieve.

It is hardly necessary however, to say that I do not see the practicability. Fourier affected to believe that the harmonian system would so greatly multiply the productiveness of labour, and would introduce such economy into the daily expenditure, that any little loss arising from a change of employment every two hours, would not be felt. I have already said that he seems to have entirely failed to show a probability of any increased productiveness of labour. As to frugality of living, if people like to inhabit barracks, without

servants at command, no doubt they might live cheaply enough. Fourier however, says that the great division of labours in a phalanstère would facilitate the constant change of occupation. Every vocation would be so cut up into simple processes that every man might be competent to take a part in many different vocations. I have already pointed out that the four hundred families of a phalanstère are not numerous enough to allow of any great subdivision, that is if we compare it with what does actually take place at present. If the different trades proposed to be carried on in a phalange, were enumerated, and the working hands told off to each branch of each occupation, the error would be apparent.

We have already seen that Fourier proposes to remunerate capital, labour, and talent. In the actual world, that of civilization as opposed to the intended world of harmony, these three things do obtain an income, though in very varying proportions. But Fourier of course, as a true system-monger, would not rest contented with this uncertainty: he would fix how much should go to the capitalist, how much to the labourer, how much to the talented man. It seems that the periodical produce is to be divided in these proportions:

To the capitalist Four-twelfths;

To the labourer Five-twelfths;

To the man of practical and
theoretical knowledge . . Three-twelfths.

Since one avocation requires much capital, another very little; and one requires much skill, another scarcely

any; it would be vastly perplexing to have to make a distribution according to such a rule.

I have remarked above, that the frugality of living in a phalanstère cannot be doubted: but then it must be considered what men would get there as to accommodation. One peculiarity is that there are to be no private servants. Domestic duties, like all other functions, are to be performed by every one in turn. I may not have to make my own bed, or to groom my own horse, to-day; but if my neighbour does these things for me this week, I shall have to return the compliment to him next week. A man who brings capital and has a larger income than many others, may avoid these menial occupations, but he will not have any one whom he can order to do a particular thing. And even the rich man will have to work, only he can choose those occupations which suit him best and being pleasant are the least remunerated. I do not say that there would be any great hardship if all men were compelled to wait on themselves: I am not even sure that the educated classes would not be far happier if they had to wait on themselves: for a mechanical occupation during a certain number of hours every day, would be a great relief to our overlaboured nervous system. An officer in the field may have to groom his own horse if he would have a horse to ride: an emigrant to Canada or Australia, will have to drive his cattle a-field, and to play the old hero in butchering his cows: and his wife, however fine a lady she may have been in the old country, must be ready to be her own nurse and dairywoman. But

reasonable or philosophical as such practices may be, we feel that to propose the adoption of them in a rich and luxurious country, with plenty of persons glad to act as menials, and to whom such a position has nothing humiliating, is to commit gratuitous folly. What may be perfectly rational in a philosophical romance, is monstrously absurd in a plan proposed for present adoption.

Madame G. de Gamond justifies this change, by drawing a frightful picture of domestic servants. It may be perfectly true that in Paris the state of morals among menials is very bad: that vice and corruption are the rule, and that an honest, pure-minded servant, male or female, is quite unusual. But this cannot be said of other countries, certainly not even of the great towns of England. I should be sorry if the following remarks were applicable to us. "In our present state, masters cannot sufficiently complain of their servants, nor servants of their masters. Both are right. The servant finds his position harsh and painful, his subjection humiliating. He gives up the best years of his life for moderate wages: the happiness of a family is denied him: the most complete self-abnegation is required, and this without stimulant or recompense. The master on his part complains of the corruption and baseness, the shameful vices, the negligence and idleness, and the clumsiness of those whom he pays, whom he admits to intimacy, and to whom he must partly entrust the care of his children. He gives the highest wages he can afford. He is annoyed and disquieted.

besieged with tricks, deserted by his servants or turns them off, and falls from bad to worse. Servants are the plague of a household, whilst they constitute a class altogether sacrificed. They revenge themselves after a fashion, by a frightful corruption of morals. Here is a new alarm for the mothers of families, a source of secret disorders, scandals, and crimes. And what remedy can be found, in civilization, for this state of things which is constantly growing worse?"

I should answer Madame Gatti de Gamond that one obvious remedy is at hand, of a nature far milder than that of shutting people up in an ornamented *union*, and denying them the use of servants. Most of the corruptions she laments, are closely connected with the practice of keeping indoor men-servants. Among the middle classes of the great English towns, this practice is comparatively rare; the men kept being generally gardeners and grooms, who live out of the house. In families of this sort, the two, three or four young women servants, are generally highly respectable, and quite equal to other young women who live at home with their parents. Any irregularity of morals is the exception; and therefore it cannot be said that in our great towns domestic service has a corrupting effect. In other respects it is positively beneficial. A young woman who lives five or ten years among people of better education than herself, who is required to be punctual, exact, orderly, and cleanly, learns many valuable lessons, and enters upon married life with notions of propriety and real refinement such as she

would never have acquired in her father's house. A country girl who begins with a loud voice and a blustering demeanour, would hardly be recognised after a few years' service, in the gentle, quiet mannered young woman who, with a perfect consciousness of her own rights, performs all her duties with precision, respected herself and respecting others. Many mechanics' families of the best class, will not allow the girls to go into factories, but send them by preference into service, and feel no more degradation in doing this than a gentleman formerly felt in entering his boy as page to a nobleman.

But directly that you introduce men-servants into your household, your difficulties begin, and the larger your establishment the greater your plague. The custom of employing men in domestic duties, is in itself somewhat repugnant to our notions of the dignity of manhood; and this thought is commonly expressed by the working classes in phrases far from complimentary to flunkeyism. If the great reformers, whose heads are always in the clouds, would address themselves to persuading people of the advantage that would follow from the abolition of indoor men-servants, they might effect some good.

Closely connected with this question of servants, is that of the rearing of children. The phalansterean arrangements in this respect, are of a singular kind. Madame Gamond introduces them with the remark that in our present state of society the care of the first years of children is very difficult and even painful. Here I am altogether at issue with her. In the house-

holds with which I am acquainted, those of the educated middle classes, the care of young children, far from being a difficulty or a source of pain, is the most pleasing of all duties. To me, no person on earth seems so happy, as a mother with a brood of young folks about her. Mental pain she has no doubt, in anxious tenderness when any of them are ill: deep grief she may be destined to suffer if any of them are lost: but when they are in good health, none so pleasantly occupied, so engrossed in agreeable duties, as the mother of a young family.

I do not wonder that a man, and he a fanatical inventor, should propound the following scheme: though I am rather surprised that a woman, and even one who regards the care of infants as a trouble, should give the plan her sanction. In our present state, as we are told, "A mother does not suffice for each child: she must be assisted by a nurse, and must pass her nights like her days. In the phalange, a large *séristère* divided into three apartments, is provided for the nurslings and for those just weaned. These rooms, well aired in summer, are kept in winter so warm as to allow the children to wear very light clothing. The cradles are moved by machinery, so that twenty are moved at once. One child can perform this service which at present occupies twenty mature women. To vary the children's position, elastic mats are used. Nets placed at intervals restrain the child without preventing it from moving, or from looking round and approaching its neighbour. Other arrangements or games are provided, so that all

may amuse themselves with play, and at the same time exercise their limbs.

“Each of the rooms is attended to, day and night, by many groups of nurses of various ages; for the care of children is pleasing to women at every stage of life. Most of the girls, women, and matrons of the phalange, voluntarily enrol themselves in the groups of nurses.” (I must observe that women who regard the care of their own infants at present, as a painful labour, will be little disposed to make any sacrifice for the offspring of others.) “The children distributed into the three rooms, according to their temper more or less mild, or crying, or diabolical, require nurses of differing characters. The women choose the groups for which they feel themselves fit. The most gentle enrol themselves in the group of diabolicals:” (very hard on the gentle tempers to spend their time in a room full of children who cry like little imps of Satan!) “The less patient enter the groups of the little angels:” (an injudicious reward for bad tempers, and enough to sour the dispositions of the whole phalange.) I am glad to find that mothers are at least allowed to suckle their own children. They are to do this by coming to the *séristère* at appointed hours; and if one mother has insufficient milk, another of more copious provision will be expected to share her supply with the child so ill provided.

All this, it must be confessed, is dreadful stuff; but it is less wonderful when other parts of the organization are understood. It will perhaps have been observed

that nothing has as yet been said as to husbands and wives, family apartments, and the arrangements for courtship and marriage. Apparently, this is a subject on which a lady could not very well enter: for, if we are to believe M. Proudhon in his noted work "*What is Property?*" Fourier's system sanctions concubinage and prostitution. Where there is no established relation of husband, wife and family, the mother might be the more easily resigned to having her infant classed in the group of "little devils," rocked by machinery, and tended by persons not under her control.

Fourier, as might be supposed, was not insensible to the importance of education. He knew that if his system were to take root, it would be by bringing up children in habits such as he required. But with regard to the instruction of the understanding, he propounded an opinion that has been held and acted on by other persons, and with such a result as might have been anticipated. "Children and youths are to be perfectly free to adopt what course they will. They may learn or remain ignorant at their pleasure. It is with study as with work; civilization alone renders it repulsive. Men at every time of life are eaten up with a desire of instruction. With all persons, men, women and children, it is a passion to learn, to acquire knowledge." I have known persons brought up under this notion of being left to choose what and how much they would learn: and as may be supposed, the things they learnt were very easy, the quantity was very small. I am no friend to overloading the mind, to treating a human

being as if he were a mere vessel into which a certain quantity of knowledge is to be crammed, or to using severity of coercion. But I think it necessary that a boy should learn many things which are uninteresting or even distasteful. While he is a boy, his general education must continue, and must include many mental exercises that require a certain degree of painful exertion. Indeed, one of the most important results of education, is to form a habit of sacrificing present ease for the sake of future advantage. A man who has not learnt this has learnt little. But it must not be expected of a boy that he should without discipline resist the temptation to present indulgence.

One more paragraph and I will conclude this long section. We have seen that Fourier entertained no ascetic ideas, but that on the contrary, instead of proposing to extirpate or even control the passions, he thought to turn them to account by giving them full play. The members of a phalanstère were to be made happy, not by subduing their desires but by gratifying them to the full. Every day's and hour's labour was to be turned into a pleasure. Besides this, distinct recreations were to be given, and amongst others the opera was to form a part of the social organization, as serving for a school of material harmony, and thus ushering in that mental or spiritual harmony which was to be the basis of the system. One part of the scheme might be unpalatable to strait-laced mothers who objected to opera girls as daughters. In the phalanstèrean opera the children of three or four years old were to be

employed in choruses, parades, evolutions, which would be calculated to train their ear and cultivate a graceful gait. Many mothers no doubt, would think these advantages dearly paid for, if they were accompanied by an increase of assurance and a diminution of modesty.

SECTION IV.—Difficulties as to money, and as to getting the better class of inmates—Wealth doubled—Interest to capitalists at eight per cent.—Reduced plan of simple harmony—Algeria a proper field—The Government neglected—Disciples, proceedings, and newspaper—Actual experiment—Failure—Fourier's death—His person—Efforts since—Estimate of Fourier

Such are some particulars of Fourier's plan. His difficulty was to get even a trial. He could do nothing without a large expenditure; and however willing labourers out of employment might have been to enlist under the new banner, the same alacrity could not be expected in persons of a higher grade. Money was the first thing wanted, but the capitalist saw nothing tempting in this home colony, on a new principle, discovered by a writing-clerk.

If this first difficulty had been overcome, another remained. Two or three hundred thousand pounds having been advanced, a square league of land having been bought, a palatial barrack having been erected, where were the industrial soldiers to come from? There were plenty of labourers with their wives, there was no lack of youths greedy of novelty, and there

was an abundance of young women not nice in point of feminine delicacy; but Fourier required more. One of the principles of the harmonian system was a graduation of rank and fortune; and this was to be carried out so strictly that each wing and each gallery, should have all ranks blended together. But how could it be expected that persons living idly in their own houses with servants to wait on them, should surrender ease, comfort, worldly consideration, to become inmates of a voluntary prison, where they must perform their daily tasks in company with persons perhaps obnoxious to them, where they would have no domestics to consult their wishes, no worldly importance to gratify their vanity? The expositor complained that up to the time she wrote these obstacles had proved insuperable.

Fourier indeed, had not gone so far as to anticipate that the rich would voluntarily put themselves on an equal footing with the poor, or the men of education and talent with the illiterate dunces. He proposed to share the periodical produce in unequal proportions between capitalists, labourers, and talented directors. Elsewhere he declared that he could afford under this very productive system, to pay to capitalists who advanced money merely as an investment, and who did not come to reside in the palace, eight per cent. on their principal: and he compares this liberal interest with that realized by Government fundholders, or by the miserable English, who are often obliged to deposit money in banks without any income at all. Capitalists however, were astoundingly dull to their own interests,

and preferred even the wildest speculations of the Bourse, to the tempting offers of the phalanstère.

Yet the prospect both to the ordinary inmates and to the capitalists were officially declared to be of a very inviting kind. "The harmonians," (name of happiness!) "possessing the minimum, secure of an increase of fortune by their labour, quite at ease as to their principal entrusted to the phalange, of which they preserve the property, and which they can realize immediately;—the harmonians enjoy the security of the savage with carelessness about the morrow; abandoned to the happiness of the present, they are not disturbed by constant fears about the future. The phalange takes charge of their fortune, as it takes charge of their household and of the education of their children.

"The phalange can offer eight per cent. interest to capitalists outside, by means of the frugality and the augmentation of wealth which arise from the societary state; it offers the surest mortgage, in pledging to each capitalist the whole of its properties, buildings, factories, herds, harvests, and even the soil." Madame de Gamond may be excused if she is ignorant that every trader and every company that borrows money, pledges to the lender all the property possessed. And Fourier himself may perhaps be excused when he makes another blunder, in saying that, "The phalange, while securing such great advantage to capitalists, proprietors of all which it possesses, doubles at the same time the value of its wealth; it positively doubles the value, since this wealth exists

once in the actual property, and once in the transferable shares. The reason of this is that there is really association, and not exploitation or coalition."

The reason assigned is neither convincing nor even intelligible. I might have suspected that this fictitious doubling of wealth was invented by the expositress; but that the same fancy occurs in the illustration of the phalanstérian principle by the parish oven. The saving by a public oven, says Fourier, is double: first to the consumers of bread, and then by the commodities which the superseded bakers produce. He forgets that if the superseded bakers did not produce other commodities, there would be no advantage gained to the community. I, a consumer, dispense with your services as a baker. I am richer by the maintenance which I formerly gave you. But you are poorer by the loss of that maintenance. I have saved 50*l.* a year; you have lost 50*l.* a year: the community which includes you and me, is neither poorer nor richer so far. But if I again use the maintenance I formerly furnished to you, and support you as a labourer in some other branch, then the community is richer by all you produce in this new branch. But under no circumstances can the community be enriched twice over by the saving. The same kind of principle may be applied to the error with regard to the doubling of the property of the phalanstère.

Fourier, finding the great difficulty of inducing a capitalist, a nobleman, or a monarch, to adopt his grand views and find five or ten million francs for the pro-

posed experiment, lowered his tone so far as to show how his principles might be carried out on a smaller scale, in proportion to the pecuniary means at hand. He recommended a *simple harmony*, which might be carried out by eighty families, or four hundred persons. Failing this, he even condescended to show how a guarantee system might be worked to advantage. By *guaranteeism* he understands "all community of interest between different trades or social classes, every guarantee given in our present state, not however fictitious but real, and including not merely a privileged class but the masses." It would be tedious to pursue this notion into particulars: it is only interesting as showing the consciousness of want of success on the part of Fourier.

It must have occurred to many persons that as the first obstacle to overcome was a want of funds, and that as the principal expense required was in the purchase of land, it would be easier to experiment in a new country, where the soil, being unoccupied, is obtainable for a trifle. A farm worth 50*l.* an acre in England, may be had in its naked state for fifty pence in America. The French however, are not an emigrating people. But after the occupation of Algeria, it was suggested that there was the place for an experiment to be made. The burning sands of Africa might be turned into an instrument for regenerating the world.

"How," says the enthusiastic Madame de Gamond; "how could the government fail to adopt such a plan, whether by taking the initiative, or by backing a joint-stock company who should undertake it? In the system

of association, the question is not of a Utopia, but of figures, of frugalities, of positive products. In the application of the system to Algeria, it would not be a question of creating in order to experiment, for a creation is absolutely necessary in order to escape from an abyss in which for eight years, men and money have been swallowed up without result, without solution of this problem as difficult and fatal now as on the first day."

It is lamentable to reflect how much the world has missed by neglecting the wisdom of Fourier. It is not merely France or Algeria, but the whole world that is the loser. One phalange having been fairly established, and offering the brilliant example of peace, plenty, industry, and content; with a population well fed, children cared for and educated, the passions turned to account; we cannot doubt of course, that the people among whom this was seen would generally follow in the train: that the whole land would be divided into phalanstères, each with its palace, or barrack, or ornamental union in the centre, with its happy groups working at whatever pleased them, and dancing or singing in unison as they laboured.

From one country the infection of happiness would have spread to another. The surly quarantines that Fourier would establish against disease, would offer every facility to the apostles of harmony; and in a few years civilization would have ceased and the harmonian and societary system would prevail. The armies of the new faith would pour forth, eager to conquer not by war, but by industry: not to subject the world to the

dominion of king and aristocracy, but to allure them to embrace the means of happiness by phalanstères, associations, groups and series. "I will admit if you please," said Fourier, "that the Roman legions destroying three hundred thousand Cimbri at St. Rémy, were covered with glory, and earned the laurel crown; but would it not be even more glorious for these two Gaulish and Roman armies to combine for creation instead of destruction, to encamp from Arles to Lyons, to throw in the course of a campaign, thirty stone bridges over the Rhone, and to construct on all its banks, dykes to protect the lands which it annually washes away? Such glory methinks, would fully equal the laurels of our heroes, whose meetings generally leave wreaths of cypress for the countries which are the theatre of their exploits."

Industrial armies, adds Madame de Gaunond, "result naturally from the system of unity. What would be impossible at present in the condition of war or strife in which nations live; the raising a million industrial athletes, drawn from fifty empires, furnishing each twenty thousand men; would take place of itself, when all states forming series of phalanges and living in harmony, would regard as their first care the cultivation and embellishment of the globe." I should have liked to test the geographical accuracy of our authoress, by asking for the names of the fifty empires so glibly set down. I think we may safely confirm her prophecy, and say that when the now civilized world is cut up into a series of phalanxes, industrial armies will be formed of them-

selves, and will do all the things she professes to anticipate. That must be a great secret which Fourier and the lady possessed, by means of which a million of men would live together in harmony, although they consisted of natives of fifty different empires. I should imagine, however, that these portentous events will not really happen until the whole world is united in one empire, of which the seat will be Constantinople.

No one I suppose, anticipates any extraordinary addition to the comforts of our race, from Fourier's discovery of the mode of bringing the Sahara into cultivation. But his notion that the climate of the world, or of some parts of it, has been deteriorated by injudicious culture, is not without foundation. Dr. John Synonds, Professor of Modern History at Cambridge about the close of the last century, recorded the damage that was done in this way in Italy. In many parts of that country cultivation has been carried too far up the mountains, injuring the neighbourhood first, by depriving the acclivities of large roots to bind the soil together, and thus leaving them at the mercy of rains to carry away the soil and fragments of rock into the valleys; and secondly, by exposing the lowlands to the chilly mountain gusts, which were previously hindered and restrained by the large trees. This however, is far too small an injury for the genius of Fourier to attempt to remedy. His mind worked on a gigantic scale.

The difficulties then, that Fourier had to contend with, were very great, and his success was small: yet

he was not altogether without disciples. It appears that as early as 1814, six years after the appearance of the *Théorie*, M. Just Muiron declared himself a convert to the harmonian system; and that he continued to be a firm believer and an active partisan. He is spoken of as a man of high ability. Several years elapsed before a second convert appeared in M. Victor Considérant, who devoted himself ardently to the new doctrine and endeavoured to popularise it. It was one of Fourier's peculiarities which unfitted him for the career of an apostle, that he was of a reserved temper and was incapable of making advances to the world around him. He wrote his books in a whimsical unintelligible style, and neglected both the topics which might have attracted attention, and the graces of style which might have secured readers. M. Considérant endeavoured to withdraw the veil from this great genius as he thought him.

This was about the time that the sect of St. Simon was on the wane. Some of the dispersed members of the Church of the New Christianity, enrolled themselves under Fourier, passing from one innovator to another. This transfer of allegiance, and this rise of the sect on the ruins of a former one, may account for the fact that the Fourierists have been regarded as subsequent to the St. Simonians; although St. Simon's New Christianity was published long after Fourier's plans, and are supposed to have been to a great extent borrowed from Fourier. Two of the deserters were men of distinguished attainments: MM. Jules Chevalier and Abel Transon. These gentlemen found it necessary in after

years, to protest that they had then long abandoned their early professions in favour of the societary state. Nothing is more remarkable than the considerable number of men of acknowledged ability who lent themselves to these strange schemes. Many able and popular publications were issued by the disciples; and Fourier, now an elderly man, became at last a person of considerable distinction; himself honoured, and his whimsical opinions supported by intelligences of a high order.

The application of the scheme to practice however, was not readily achieved. The disciples found it difficult to command the quarter of a million sterling necessary for an experiment on the grand harmony: and the shameful failure of the St. Simonian association, with its hundreds or thousands of workpeople, did not tend to reassure the apprehensive. Nevertheless a journal called the "Phalanstère" was started, under the auspices of a Madame Vigoureux and many gentlemen. At last an actual experiment was made. Now was the time for hope and anxiety. If this one phalange succeeded, the whole country would be revolutionized by the mania of imitation: farms would be bought up, houses pulled down, servants dismissed, families broken up; and all the world would be dancing and singing in merry groups worthy of pastoral days. At Condé-sur-Vesgres, a vast property was devoted to the purpose of a phalange. Proceedings were actually commenced: some of the fields were cultivated on the principles laid down: a few farm buildings were

erected. But unfortunately, money was soon wanting; the discovery was made that the funds were insufficient; the world did not rush in to the rescue; and Fourier, with his disciples, had the mortification of confessing an abortive attempt.

If this effort could not fairly be called a failure, it yet produced the bad effects of a failure, and threw new difficulties in the way. The world laughed; the disciples were discouraged; and many of them apostatised to the civilized world, which with all its imperfections had at least the faculty of motion and some kind of success. The "Phalanstère" newspaper was stopped, and Fourier again sulked. M. Victor Considérant however, though checked, was not beaten: and he again commenced the sectarian journal, which he converted into a daily paper. The disciples for a long time however, were again reduced to speculation, recommending in words certain strange theories and wild social practices, but living and moving in the world like ordinary mortals.

Fourier was now sixty-six years old, and to the burden of long-continued disappointment, and to the weight of years, was added a mortal disease, which after some months of pain carried him off. His disciples allowed him to die in the same poverty in which he had always lived. Of a stoical and independent character, he may have refused offers of pecuniary assistance which are seldom wanting to the observed of many observers. His friends were not deficient in attention to his wants during his last sickness.

His person, we are told, was short and thin; his countenance striking; his look grave and melancholy; his brow that of one who had thought much and suffered much. I should suppose, judging from his care to protect his fictitious workmen from rain, that he had himself a cat-like aversion to wet, an aversion difficult to be understood by an Englishman, except on the supposition of a delicate habit of body caused by sedentary habits.

Since Fourier's death, several other attempts have been made to carry his scheme into practice. His friends have no reason to regret that he died before witnessing the results; for in every instance there has been failure. In many and distant regions, in France and the United States, in Africa and Brazil, there has been the same undeviating disaster: everywhere has the phalanstère gone through the same rapid process of creation and decay. Much money has been spent; not indeed as I think, without result, because I regard every expenditure of money on such experiments, as a warning against future follies; but without any result favourable to Fourier's schemes. The imbecilities of New Christianity and harmonian phalanges, are far less likely to gain a footing in the world since the trials that have been made, than they were before. So many lighthouses the more have been set up, against the shoals that beset thoughtful and speculative natures. Follies of socialistic and religious sects there will still be: but they are less fitted to seduce the educated classes than they would have been, if these examples of

the ignis fatuus had not flitted across the world and had their wanderings recorded.

In endeavouring to estimate Fourier and his followers, we naturally inquire what was thought of them by their countrymen and especially by their fellow-innovators. If these last may be suspected of some of the jealousy of rival sectarians, they may yet furnish us with facts and suggestions worthy of our attention. Fourier's friends claimed for him a profound and extensive acquaintance with literature and science. M. Louis Reybaud, writing while he was still young, allowed this claim to pass uncontested, and himself speaks of Fourier as a man of great power in his studies and of very extensive reading. "Fourier touches on all the sciences, exact or natural, with authority and superiority; he touches on literature by a crowd of ingenious quotations; on history by the proofs that he draws from it; on industry, by observations of sense and a great range; on mathematics by the severe deductions which he borrows from them; on philosophy by a system of constant aggression which clearly shows him to have viewed it on every side." This is the kind of praise which a man might fairly bestow on a Descartes, a Leibnitz, or a Pascal. It was written in 1837, and in 1849 M. Reybaud confesses that he had formerly taken too favourable a view of the innovators generally and of Fourier among the others; but he says nothing of any over-estimation of the great harmonian's capacity or attainments: he leaves us to suppose that Fourier really was a very superior person.

Now let us turn to Proudhon, a man of great scholastic power, whatever we may think of the purpose to which he applied his ability. "Of all the modern socialists, the disciples of Fourier have long seemed to me the most advanced and almost the only ones worthy of the name. If they could only have understood that their task was to address themselves to the people, to awaken their sympathies, to hold their tongues on what they did not understand; if their pretensions had been more humble, and their respect for public opinion greater, perhaps we might have been indebted to them for a beginning of reform. But these determined reformers: how is it that they are perpetually on their knees before power and opulence, *i. e.*, before what is the most antagonistic to reform? How is it, in an age of reason, that they do not see that the world is to be converted by demonstration, not by myths and allegories? How is it that, implacable adversaries as they are of civilization, they borrow from it whatever it has the most fatal: property, inequality of fortune and of rank, gluttony, concubinage, prostitution, and what not? theurgy, magic, diablerie? Why these interminable declamations against ethics, metaphysics, psychology, while the abuse of these sciences, ignorant as they are of them, constitutes their system? Why this mania for worshipping a man whose principal merit was to talk nonsense about a crowd of things of which he knew only the name, in a style the strangest possible? Whoever admits the infallibility of a man, becomes for that very reason unable to instruct

others; whoever surrenders his reason, will soon forbid free inquiry. The phalansterians would not be wanting if they had the power. Let them condescend to reason, let them proceed methodically, let them give us demonstrations, not revelations, and we will hear them willingly: then let them organize trade, agriculture, commerce; let them make labour attractive, the humblest functions honourable, and our applause shall follow. Especially let them abandon that air of illuminati which makes them look like impostors or dupes, rather than believers or apostles."

Such is the severe estimate of Fourier and his followers, formed by Proudhon; a man little addicted to pronounce *éloges*, and much better fitted to play the *avvocato del diavolo* in the Roman Catholic Church. There would be few saints in Proudhon's calendar. Louis Blanc speaking parenthetically of Fourier, laughs at the whimsicality of his style, but says not a word leading us to suppose that he shared in Proudhon's contempt.

Yet the absurdities betrayed in the quotations I gave in the early part of this chapter, will lead most persons to lean to the severe estimate of Fourier's powers. We shall not readily believe that a man of high attainments, of real acquaintance with history, mathematics, natural science, and moral philosophy, could put forth such monstrosities of opinion as the prophecies of the auroral crown to light the earth; or could seriously anticipate the organization of industrial armies to reclaim the burning desert. St. Simon's New Christianity was

absurd enough, and yet its author is not denied to have been a man of genius. But on religion, as perhaps on medicine, all men are more or less insane: the health of the mind and the health of the body, are topics in which we are too deeply interested to allow of an impartial judgment. Fourier's eccentricities were of another sort, and were scarcely such as we find in men of real superiority.

CHAPTER IV.

LOUIS BLANC.

SECTION I.—Louis Blanc's *Organization of labour*.—Begins with a child frozen to death—A change necessary—Louis Blanc not an epicurean or an ascetic—But hopes cessation of struggle—Formula of progress—Denunciation of the rich—Of England—Antagonism of capital and labour—Louis Blanc's theory of English policy—To conquer by commerce: by *laissez-faire*—English rapacity and unscrupulousness, but greatness and high political virtue—More examples of Louis Blanc's thoughts—Professed moderation—Education, if imperfect, injurious.

IN my sketches of St. Simon and Fourier, I have depended to a considerable extent on the notices of reformers by M. Louis Reybaud; though as to both those heresiarchs I have consulted authorities among their avowed friends. In the present chapter I am deserted by my excellent guide, who does not include in his publication any of the later celebrities. Louis Blanc is still living an exile from France, writing the history of a recent period of his country, the object of Napoleon's dislike, perhaps of his dread. Even before the *coup d'état* which placed the Emperor on the throne, Louis Blanc was a denizen of England: and when the news of the president's transformation into a monarch reached his ears, he set off for Paris, but stopped short of the goal, finding the case a hopeless one, and returned to his solitary lodgings.

We must all remember that one of the results of the revolution of 1848, was the establishment of national workshops in Paris. The history of that experiment I intend to sketch in a future chapter: but at present I propose to inquire what it was that led to this gigantic attempt at superseding private enterprise.

We can hardly doubt that St. Simon and Fourier led the way. Their plans for the re-construction of society were constantly before the public. Lectures were abundantly given, journals were set on foot and laboriously circulated, money was subscribed, numerous partizans were enrolled, establishments were constructed. All these attempts, it is true, ended in disaster. But the world became familiar with the new notions, and what was much worse, it acquired exaggerated notions of the sufferings which are endured under the prevailing system. The failures of the efforts made might be the result of accident, or of incapacity on the part of the leaders, or of a thousand difficulties which further experience might overcome. Few inventions are perfected at once, and communism like other novelties might require numerous experiments to bring it to perfection.

The thing required then, was to perfect the theory of a new plan. To this task Louis Blanc devoted himself in his *Organization of Labour*; a short volume of great eloquence; of which I propose in this chapter to give a rapid sketch.

Louis Blanc addresses himself to the rich, on the ground that the cause of the poor is their cause. He

commences by reminding the Parisians that lately, within sound of neighbouring rejoicings, a poor child had been frozen to death; and that the public had expressed no astonishment. Private charity might prevent such catastrophes if they were infrequent, but thousands of persons are in constant anxiety as to their food, clothes, and lodging. How should this be? How, in the midst of a boasted civilization, does half the human race suffer this frightful humiliation, this protracted agony?

I will venture to observe here, that Louis Blanc already shows his tendency to exaggeration. Thousands in Paris want the necessities of life: granted. But in the question that follows, the thousands are converted into half the human race. I quote a characteristic passage:

"The problem is obscure. It is terrible. It has provoked revolts which have ensanguined the earth without setting it free. It has exhausted generations of thinkers. It has worn out self-devotion of a majesty truly divine. During these two thousand years whole nations have knelt before a scaffold, adoring in him who died, the Saviour of men. And yet how many slaves! How many lepers in the moral world! How many miserable in the visible and tangible world! How many iniquities triumphant! How many tyrannies enjoying at their ease the scandals of their impunity! The Redeemer is come: when will redemption follow?"

The law of progress however, is confessed; and therefore despondency is inexcusable. Only we must

attack the problem with trembling and humility, hoping that though no one person can solve it, many by their combined efforts, may. "Besides, to direct our understanding towards the things which agitate our heart, to present the torch of science to society, to think and feel at the same time, to combine in one effort of love, both vigilance of understanding and powers of the soul, to place such brave confidence in the future of nations and the justice of God, as to struggle against the continuance of evil and its lying immortality . . . can there be a more dignified employment of time and life?"

Louis Blanc wrote this volume in January, 1845. He says that four or five years before that time, the words *organization of labour*, if uttered were unheeded; but that at the date of his work they resounded in every corner of France. M. Ledru Rollin had said in his journal *La Réforme*, "Let us open an inquiry into the lot of the workmen;" and this simple remark had echoed through France. If it is meant here that Ledru Rollin was the first to say this, there is shown a strange forgetfulness of the innovators whose efforts I have already recorded, and of a hundred other writers who had expressed sympathy with the labouring classes. The names of St. Simon and of Fourier however, were of evil omen. Decent people must have remembered with aversion the one, whose latest followers had gone off in search of the female Messiah, and the other who was no friend to the holy ties of family and kindred. But the very men whose memory was

despised, had laid the train which a spark from Ledru Rollin kindled.

Some people however, say that there is danger in directing the attention of workmen to their misery, before securing to them their sovereignty; and that it is wiser to cultivate material and gross enjoyments rather than awaken those grand motives called human dignity, honour, glory, pride of right, country. But what as to that "admirable and sombre motto of the famishing rioters of Lyons: *live working or die fighting* : was that impressed with materialism?" Life and labour; on these two words hangs the destiny of man.

Now comes Louis Blanc's creed: generally clothed, hidden, in a multitude of words, but here distinctly stated in one sentence. *Whenever the certainty of living by labour does not follow from the very essence of social institutions, there iniquity reigns.* An English reader would suppose that upon this maxim would be founded a discussion of the principles of population, or a defence of a liberal poor-law. He would expect an attack on Malthus, as one who with benevolent intentions was guilty of cold-blooded cruelty; as one who with words of piety in his mouth blasphemed the Creator of man: or he would anticipate a eulogium on the principle of our poor-laws, which secure, if not work, yet subsistence, to every human being in the country, be he Briton or foreigner, exemplary or wicked, capable of work or bowed down by age and sickness. Such a reader will be disappointed. Louis Blanc troubles himself not about Malthus or poor-laws. He has a

remedy of his own in the organization of labour, a scheme by which every man, woman, and child, shall earn a subsistence for themselves by honest industry, and shall be set free from the humiliating dependence on the cold hand of charity.

But for the present the manner of organization is postponed to an eloquent enforcement of the necessity of a change. After some remarks on the way in which misery causes robberies, assassination, prostitution; our author goes on: "We desire then, that labour should be so organized as to cause the suppression of misery: not merely in order that the physical sufferings of the people should be mitigated, but also, and above all that every one should recover his self-esteem; that excessive wretchedness should cease to smother the noble aspirations of thought and the enjoyment of a legitimate pride; that room might be found for all in the dominions of education and intelligence; that no one any longer should be enslaved and absorbed by watching a revolving wheel; that no child should be transformed into a means of augmenting the wages of a family, no mother armed against the fruit of her bowels by the necessity of living, no girl compelled to barter for daily bread the sweet name of love. We desire that labour should be organized, that the soul of the people; its soul I say; may no more be crushed and corrupted under the tyranny of events."

Louis Blanc shrinks from the charge of wishing to pamper the body at the expense of the soul; a charge that was made, reasonably enough, against Fourier;

who desired to subdue the passions by giving them their full swing and thus exhausting them; and made also against at least the later followers of St. Simon. Louis Blanc protests also against asceticism. We of the Protestant faith have no great respect for voluntary fasting and self-denial, unless as a means of attaining some distinct good. But in a Roman Catholic country the following remarks have more significance.

“It is true that Christianity has anathematised the flesh. But this anathema was only a necessary reaction from the grossness of heathen morals. Paganism had been a long and brutal victory of force over intelligence, of the senses over the mind. Christianity did not come to re-establish an equilibrium; it prolonged the contest by displacing victory. Thus, after having, together with the dogmas of original sin, of the fall of angels, of paradise and hell, adopted the ancient theory of the struggle of two principles: the *good* and the *ill*: it placed the principle of ill in *matter*. But was it needful to confound what Christianity had of relative or transitory, with what it had of divine or eternal? Was it needful to declare that suffering is for ever sacred?

“Suffering was sacred in the apostle, who for the propagation of new ideas, devoted himself to severe privations and nameless fatigues; it was sacred in the martyr, the enthusiastic and invincible soldier of Christ: it could not be sacred either in the hermit, forgetting the service of men that in voluntary exile he might pour forth groans full of himself; nor in the devotee,

bent on humiliating by an useless and slow suicide, his own body the inviolable work of God."

It is not perfectly clear in what way the interests of the poor are concerned in this disquisition on the text, "the flesh warreth against the spirit and the spirit against the flesh." That this war does take place within the microcosm of man, be he Christian, Mahometan, or Pagan, cannot be denied. It is the combat of duty against desire, of benevolence against selfishness, of reason against passion. That affliction has frequently a chastening and renovating effect on the mind is equally certain. But no Protestant would palliate any suffering unnecessarily inflicted on the poor, under a pretence that it is good for their souls. We should all say that much pain and grief are inevitable, but that it is not the less our duty to reduce them to their lowest dimensions.

Yet Louis Blanc is disposed to hope that the discord we have spoken of, may one day cease. "For why should not harmony in man succeed one day or other to antagonism? Why should not harmony become the law of individual life as it is the law of worlds?" I would rather ask, why should we expect a cessation of that which in the history of man has always existed? And why should Louis Blanc in developing his organization of labour, rush into these abysses of philosophy, which the light of thousands of years has left obscure as ever?

Now let us see our reformer's formula of progress; and let us further, hear his denunciations of the rich

and powerful. "The formula of progress is double in its unity: *Amelioration moral and material of the lot of all, by the free concurrence of all and by their fraternal association!* A reproduction of our fathers' heroic motto in the revolution of fifty years ago; liberty, equality, fraternity.

"Whimsical and sad combination! The privileged classes of our days are sunk in sensualism; they have invented unheard-of refinements in luxury: pleasure is their religion; they have pushed the dominions of the senses to the very limits of fancy; for them, to employ life is nothing, to enjoy it is everything. And it is from the bosom of this world of pleasure, it is from the depths of the gilded boudoirs where philosophy is cradled, that we are adjured to make no appeal to material interests, when we ask on behalf of the poor, certainty of labour, daily bread, shelter, clothes, the opportunity of love, and hope."

Louis Blanc found objectors of another kind: men who feared attempts at social improvement or new social organizations, as elbowing and hindering the anticipated efforts for political alterations: republicans in truth, who regarded the attainment of a commonwealth as the only thing worth striving for. To *illuminati*, the present misery of the people is nothing, as compared with the marvels to arise from the ruins of the throne; nay, that misery may be even a disguised blessing if it stimulate the people to revolt. But "what do you fear? The inculcation of false notions as to the condition of the prolétaire and the

means of amending it? If these notions are false, discussion will scatter them as the wind scatters the chaff. What is it that you fear? That the boldness of certain solutions of political problems should disturb men's minds, and hinder the progress of political reform? But do not questions of universal suffrage and the real popular sovereignty, frighten everyone in France? And what should we do but show by convincing reasons the puerility and emptiness of these alarms? Mark however! That which gives most alarm in parties, is not what they reveal but what they conceal. The unknown! This it is which terrifies feeble souls. Shall the democratic party be accused of urging on an industrial jacquerie, when it shall have scientifically developed the means of saving industry from the frightful disorder in which it is entangled? Shall a blind repugnance of the middle classes, be aimed against it, when it is proved that the constantly increasing concentration of capital threatens the middle class with the same yoke under which the working class already bends?

“Let us add that to attract to political reform a great number of popular adherents, it is indispensable to show the connection that exists between an amelioration of their lot and a change of power. This is the course taken at all times by the people's true friends or avengers. This was the course taken of old by those who, moved by sacred pity for the cruelly persecuted debtors, collected the multitude on Mount Aventine. This was the course taken by the immortal Tiberius Gracchus, when, convicted of denouncing the usurpa-

tions of the Roman patricians, he cried to the pale conquerors of the world, 'You are called masters of the universe, and you have not a stone on which to lay your head.' This was the course taken by the fisherman Masaniello, when in the midst of Naples famished by the viceroy's orgies, he cried aloud, 'Down with the taxes!' This finally, was the course taken fifty years ago, by those fanatical philosophers, those brave soldiers of thought, who perished in their task only because they lived too early. From him who leads, the people has a right to inquire whither he conducts them. Too often has it happened, to be excited about words, to fight in darkness, to suffer exhaustion in absurd self-devotedness, and to inundate with the people's blood shed at hazard, the track of ambitious men, tribunes to-day and to-morrow declared oppressors."

The *Organization of Labour*, it will be seen, is a very declamatory production, dealing little in particular facts, and garnished with an abundance of sweeping assertions. Such a work would be incomplete in the eyes of the French people, if it did not contain some philippic against *perfid Albion*. A French author may neglect Germany or Italy, he may overlook little Belgium and Holland, he may forget Spain and Portugal, and even omit Russia; but if he says nothing of Great Britain, he disappoints the expectation of his readers, most of whom dislike and all of whom fear the islanders, their rivals of a thousand years. Louis Blanc plays his part in this respect admirably. He attributes to us the discovery that capital and labour

are naturally enemies, and says that we were the first to inquire, how it would be possible to make these antagonistic powers live peaceably and render mutual assistance. There is, no doubt, a sense in which it is true, that capital and labour have opposite interests. If a capitalist manufacturer can lower the wages of his men without making any other change, he will increase his profits by the amount that wages are reduced. If all the capitalists engaged in a particular English manufacture, could lower the wages they pay, competition would prevent any permanent rise of profit, but there would be some rise for a time, besides the advantage of being able to undersell their rivals of other countries. If this fall of wages should take place in the same manufacture throughout the world, competition would prevent any manufacturer from being permanently benefited. But if wages in every department of industry throughout the world should fall, the owners of property would certainly be advantaged. There is a certain quantity of periodical produce to be distributed: the less is apportioned to labourers, the more remains for other classes. So far there is an antagonism between capitalists and labourers. On the other hand nothing is clearer than this: that an increase of capital tends to the benefit of the labourer, and that the free competition of capitalists among each other, tends to raise the rate of wages. In two countries similarly situated as to land and population, labourers will be the better paid where capital is the more abundant. While labourers therefore, have the same antagonism to employers, that

sellers always have to buyers, labourers, have also a direct benefit from the capital which maintains them, and a decided interest in its rapid accumulation.

But, says Louis Blanc, the English seeing this alleged antagonism, came to the conclusion that the only way to keep the peace between the two classes, was to find constant employment for the labourers. *Therefore*, said they, "let us open infinite channels for human activity, and let no obstacle be found to interrupt the course. Let us proclaim the *laissez-faire* boldly and without reserve. English productions are too uniform to furnish an extensive career to commerce? Well, let us educate sailors and build vessels to engross the commerce of the world. We inhabit an island? We will frequent the coasts of all continents. The kinds of raw produce which our agriculture affords, are too limited? We will fetch from the earth's extremities, materials to manufacture. All nations will become consumers of English products, and England will work for all nations. To produce, still to produce, and to solicit all nations to consume, this shall be the task for the power of England; this it is which shall multiply her wealth and shall develop the genius of her children.

"A gigantic plan! A plan almost as egotistical as absurd, and which during nearly two centuries, England has followed with incredible perseverance. No doubt, to be shut up in an island, unfruitful, and foggy, and to issue from it to conquer the world, not with soldiers but with traders; to launch thousands of vessels towards east and west, north and south; to teach a hundred

countries the use of their own treasures; to sell to America the productions of Europe, and to Europe the riches of India; to give by her existence life to every nation, and to attach them to her girdle as it were by the ties of an universal commerce; to find in gold a power capable of balancing that of the sword, and in Pitt a man capable of checking the audacity of Napoleon; in all these things there is a stamp of greatness which dazzles and astonishes the mind."

England has no reason to complain of Louis Blanc's estimate: but the accuracy of the details may be questioned. *Laissez-faire* two centuries ago? And on the part of a nation which compelled people to bury their dead in woollen shrouds; which but the other day continued the prohibition of exporting sheep's wool, and even carried a similar statute as low as rabbits' wool; which prevented other nations from trading to its colonies and its colonies from manufacturing for themselves; which in a thousand ways hampered and hindered industry? *Laissez-faire* is the adopted child of the present generation; but the foundation of England's greatness was laid under a restrictive system. As to any plan on the part of Great Britain: I believe that the world has seen plans of dominion; that the followers of Loyola had a plan handed down from one generation to another, of subduing the world through kings and by schools; that the Roman Catholic Church had a long-continued scheme for treading under foot the civil power; that the United States have a project nurtured in the soul of the tyrant majority,

of gathering all the northern continent under their republican wings; that Russia has a plan constructed by the sensual Catherine, fostered by the imbecile Paul, approved by the genial Alexander and the princely Nicholas, of appropriating Turkey and predominating over the West: while England with its marked individualism and its perpetual conflict of powers, has peaceably conquered the world by no scheme, but by leaving everything to the energy of private men: having, in this sense, always trusted to the *laissez-faire*, not in trade but in politics.

But we are told further, "to attain her aim, what has not England attempted? To what point has she not pushed the rapacity of her hopes and the delirium of her pretensions? Must we recall how she got possession of Essequibo and Surinam, of Ceylon and Demerara, of Tobago and St. Lucia, of Malta and Corfu, encircling the globe in the immense net of her colonies? We know what footing she got at Lisbon since the Methuen treaty, and by what abuse of power she has raised in the Indies her merchant tyranny, by the side of the Dutch dominion, mingled with the fragments of the colonial edifice constructed by Vasco de Gama and Albuquerque. Every one knows the evils her avidity has inflicted on France, and by what war of silent plots and perfidious instigations, she succeeded in quenching with blood the Spanish establishments in South America. And what shall we say of the outrages which have so long secured to her the empire of ocean? Has she ever respected or even acknowledged the rights of

neutrals? Has not the law of blockade become in her hands, the most arrogant of tyrannies? And has she not made of the right of search the most odious brigandage? And with what object? That she might have, we repeat, raw produce for her manufactures and customers for her goods."

Many other harsh things does Louis Blanc, the democrat, say of Great Britain and its aristocracy. At the time he wrote indeed, an unusually bitter feeling against us existed in France, in consequence of the Syrian question, which all but led to blows. But after all, the censures passed upon us are not of such a kind as to cause much irritation: for our power, wealth, greatness, are acknowledged; and the faults or crimes alleged against us are of a political character, and are such as we should expect to be laid to our charge by an enemy of our institutions. Besides, wild as is Louis Blanc against monarchy and aristocracy, he is not so blinded by natural prejudice as to deny us much that is great.

"But I will say no more; I will not complete this mournful sketch; lest any one should accuse me of a desire to insult the ancient and powerful English race. Notwithstanding all the ill that England has done to the world and to my country, I will not and cannot forget that she lays claim to immortal passages in the history of nations: that she was visited by liberty before the other races of Europe: that her laws even under the yoke of an oppressive aristocracy, have offered amazing and solemn homage to the dignity of men: that from her bosom sprang the wildest but loudest cry which

was heard, against the tyranny of papacy and inquisition : that even to-day she is the only country in which the rage of politics has not stifled hospitality, to the destruction of the weak. For there it is that you, poor and noble exiles, athletes unconquered though wounded, have found an asylum ! there that you have collected your scattered fortunes : there that you have partaken the life of mind and heart, the only good left you under that great disaster, the anger of your enemies : and there also that you follow in thought us, nearly as unhappy, nearly as much exiled as yourselves ; since we have looked around us to find our country though living in her bosom, and have found her, alas ! so humiliated that no longer did we know her." This noble tribute to our virtue may well excuse the philippic that precedes it. Louis Blanc was rewarded for his candour. In a few years he was himself a banished man, living among the people whose hospitality he had praised ; and secure that no demands of French tyranny, no English court intrigue, no antipathy on the part of the aristocracy he had abused, would deprive him of his safe asylum so long as he obeyed the mild laws of England. But for the candour he had exhibited, to have received such favours would have been galling.

I am endeavouring in this section to give a general idea of Louis Blanc's style of thought, just as I have quoted many outrageous passages of Fourier's writings, in order to exhibit him in his true light, as a mountebank of science and literature. Louis Blanc, wild as is his

democracy, and unfounded as are his notions of social economy, writes with sense, decorum, and striking eloquence. I give the contents of a few more pages, before I enter on his peculiar views as to the evils of competition, and as to the just relation of workmen and employers.

I have already mentioned one instance of candour in this work, and I might find others. Thus in a note to an edition subsequent to the first, the author says that since the former publication, various objections to the proposed system had been raised; but that this is as it ought to be, for that men are at present suspicious of novelty, that the criticisms however, were candid and moderate, and even showed a lively interest in the object proposed. The work it seems, was seized by the Government, but the *Sidèle*, which had combated the principles of the book, remonstrated strongly against the seizure. The petty sessions or grand jury, or the French equivalent for these, refused to indict; but Louis Blanc expresses his gratitude warmly to M. Chambolle for the support rendered in the *Sidèle*.

It is pleasing to find these amenities expressed by the stern satirist and reformer, and equally so to learn that he desires to practise moderation in carrying out his views. He even fears that some of his friends may suspect him of too earnest a desire to propitiate men of property. He avows that if his scheme were carried out, private capitals would be absorbed, and yet he says he is desirous of conciliating the capitalist. His reason for this is not merely that he feels it necessary to make

a compromise with numerous and deeply seated repugnances and prejudices, but also that he wishes to reform society without revolutionizing it; to give to men's interests greater fertility and security, without the risk of savagely disturbing an existence founded on abuse. I fear that if we came to particulars, Louis Blanc's moderation might seem to us extreme violence; and yet it is satisfactory to find that moderation is sometimes a virtue even in his eyes.

One other point mentioned, this section shall conclude. Louis Blanc's notions on education may seem to some reformers, insufficient or heretical. He says that even if a labouring man can spare some time from his work, to allow a slight exertion for the improvement of his mind, yet the instruction he receives must be of a very elementary character. But to learn, is not profitable to a man if he only gets a few fully formed ideas lodged in his understanding, and a few facts in his memory: it is not profitable unless it leads him to reflection; for then only the man is developed. *Very imperfect instruction is not merely useless, it is dangerous.* It is curious to find a red-hot reformer echoing Pope's maxim that a little learning is a dangerous thing. It is equally curious to note that one of a school which is apt to abuse statistics as a science of error, should himself bolster up this old-world Tory notion, by founding upon statistics and in a most unsatisfactory manner. England he says is better instructed than Wales, and yet England has more crimes to punish. What does he, what does his authority, M. Duméril, know about the crimes com-

mitted? Nothing. They know how many crimes were punished, but they ought to know that this is no test of the crimes committed, as comparing town with country. It is added that in comparing some Prussian provinces, crime increases in proportion as education increases. The case may stand thus. In comparing towns with country parts, there are found in towns more education and more commitments to prison. Do these gentlemen really believe that if in towns the education were reduced to the country standard, the commitments would fall to the same standard? Wonderful reasoners! who, bent upon reforming the world, are ignorant of the first principles of social science. I must add, in justice, that this oft-repeated yet palpable blunder, of confounding crimes committed and crimes detected, is not peculiar to one class of writers or to one side the Channel.

SECTION II.—Particular argument—Every man entitled to employment—Competition condemned—Must cause a constant fall of wages—I deny this—Facts in England—In France—Troyes—Matters generally grow worse—Audacious crime—An example of misery and murder—But low wages (I say) are not the principal cause of crime—Louis Blanc condemns individualism, and savings' banks, as leading to servility and avarice—French dread of a poor-law—Effect of competition on middle classes—Law of conspiracy—Illustration—I say, exceptional—Louis Blanc condemns morcellement of land.

I hope that the previous section has given a general notion of Louis Blanc's tone of thought and style of expressing it. I proceed now, to the argument contained in the *Organization of Labour*.

The working man, we are told, is born into a world of which he finds the soil occupied and the fruits engrossed. He cannot hunt or shoot; for the right to these sports is appropriated: he cannot enter a field to drink at a spring without committing a trespass. If he begs by the wayside he is arrested as a mendicant; if he pillows his head on the road he is treated as a vagabond. He has no means of living at home or emigrating abroad. If he asks for work and is refused, what is he to do next?

On these considerations we are bound to secure work to every man. Not that this is all, or nearly all, that we ought to do; but this at least we are bound to do. And if we fail in this duty, if we reduce a man to the necessity of taking by force that which he cannot earn, the man so neglected and driven to steal for his living, is doing no wrong; and the society which puts him to death for his breach of law, is not a judge but an assassin. In England, we should say, a man so indigent has always the resource of the workhouse, and theoretically, if not practically, no one need steal or starve. But in France where there is no parish system the case may be as described.

Let us assume then, as a principle, that in France, since a man has no right to maintenance without work, society is bound to take care that no man shall be without work. But at present everything is left to the struggle of one man with another; and the question is whether this is a means of securing work to all. Competition, says Louis Blanc, is the putting up labour to

auction. An employer wants a man: three men offer themselves, and are asked their terms. One says he must have three francs a day, for he has a wife and children to maintain. Another has a wife and no children, and will be content with two francs and a half. A third, who is unmarried, asks only two francs. The single man gets the place and leaves the other two, with their dependents, to starve. Such is competition.

For anything I know to the contrary by personal experience, this may be competition in France, but it is not such in England. Here certainly, there is a market price for labour, and this determines the rate given without any reference to domestic circumstances. A workman rolls a ton of bar iron and gets so many shillings for it: or makes a thousand nails and gets so many pence for them. Master and man would be equally astonished by a proposition that John should get 12s. for his ton because he has a wife and family, Thomas 10s. because he has a wife but no family, Richard only 8s. because he is a bachelor. There may be instances in which a labourer takes something less than the usual rate because he has only himself to maintain, but such cases are too exceptional to disturb the argument. It is true that old military pensioners will take situations as watchmen or light-porters at low wages; but then there are few situations that they can fill, and their services are not generally very valuable. When they do learn a trade they expect to receive the current rate of wages. Under the old administration of the English poor-laws, wages were made up out of

the rates according to the number of children a labourer had, and this was felt to be a gross abuse. It flourished however, in a time when everything was out of joint just at the close of last century: when bread was at twice its usual price, and farmers would not raise wages materially, fearing that they should not be able to lower them again. Besides, this variation of wages according to the need of the labourer, was not the result of competition but of legal interference with free competition: and it may be observed generally, that it is in the more backward states of society that maintenance is doled out according to the necessities of the receiver. Slaves, and even serfs, dependent upon patrons, are not paid or maintained like freemen, according to the market value of their labour, but according to the necessity each man, with his family, has for the necessaries of life. The illustration therefore, I think, is an unhappy one, and one that a manufacturer would scarcely have used.

But, says Louis Blanc, who does not see that under the empire of unlimited competition, a constant fall of wages is a fact necessarily general, and not at all exceptional? I confess that I am myself one of those blind persons who do not see this fact, or rather of those persons of so distorted a vision as to see the very reverse. Two men are tugging at the opposite ends of a rope: the stronger will master the weaker. Is the master always stronger than the servant? A butcher and a particular customer are perpetually haggling about the price of meat. Will beef be con-

stantly falling or constantly rising? Neither. Sometimes it rises steadily for years together; then it falls as steadily during a few years; afterwards it remains uniform for a term. Why should not the same rule hold good in the case of wages? When there are an unusual number of workmen in search of employment, wages will tend to fall: when there are more masters than usual in search of workmen, wages will tend to rise. As the labouring classes become more intelligent and more provident, wages again tend to rise, because the knowing, steady, self-reliant man, will exert more resolution than the weak, dependent, creature; and by migration, by emigration, or by abstinence from marriage, an improved position will be achieved.

Then again: unlimited competition has been the *régime* for many years. If the rates of wages must of necessity be constantly falling under this *régime*, no doubt it has been constantly falling all along. Is this the case? Have the ploughmen and mechanics of Great Britain been constantly deteriorating in their maintenance for centuries past? I make no doubt that they have been improving from age to age: I am quite convinced that the country labourer of to-day commands more of the necessaries and comforts of life than his predecessor of a hundred years ago. I say nothing of the average wages now, and at that earlier time, because the vast increase of towns, where men are better paid than in the country, raises the mean rate of the whole to a far higher level than anything formerly dreamt of. But I take the lowest ground, that

of the wages of the ordinary labourer in a rural district. A hundred years ago, such a man received 5s. to 6s. a week: he now receives 10s. to 12s. a week. Wheat indeed is now much higher, but bread has not risen in anything like the same proportion; so that it is doubtful whether the quartern loaf is nearly half as high again as it used to be. I fancy that a man with 7s. to 7s. 6d. a week now, is as well off as the ordinary labourer was a hundred years back; and therefore, with 3s. a week more than this, he must have many additional comforts.

But if the ordinary English labourer is only as well off now as then, what goes with the argument? How is it that the inevitable fall has not taken place? Nor is there any reason to think that France has deteriorated more than England. Hear what Louis Blanc himself says elsewhere: "A journal devoted to the present social order, quoted the other day these sad lines which fell from the pen of a prelate, the Bishop of Strasburg. 'Formerly,' said the mayor of a little town, 'with 300 francs I paid my workmen; now, 1,000 francs are scarcely enough. If we do not give very high wages, they threaten to go to the manufacturers.' And how must agriculture, the true wealth of a State, suffer from such a state of things!" How grossly inconsistent is Louis Blanc! How must agriculture suffer! (that is the farmer and landowner.) But if they are pinched it is because of a rise of wages, and this under free competition. From all we know of the condition of France we have reason to believe that there, as here, the real

wages of the labourers, the means of living they command, have increased gradually during the last century. Where then, is the inevitable reduction caused by unlimited competition?

We are furnished however, with a list of various classes of workmen, together with the wages they commonly receive, and the number of months they may expect work. But according to our author, men will accept a lower rate if they are unmarried than will be taken by men with incumbrances. He ought therefore, to have given us three columns: wages paid to married men with children; wages paid to married men without children; wages paid to single men. He knows well enough that no such distinction exists: but why did he found an argument on it?

The wages of women are lower in Paris than in London, if the rates here given are to be trusted; though as the hours of work are not specified, the statement is not worth much. A *chaussonnière* is set down as earning 6*d.* a day all the year round: other inferior sempstresses 7½*d.* a day, with a deduction for three months of the *dead season*. In London I fear, many women may be found gaining as little as 9*d.* a day: and if we bear in mind that Louis Blanc is disposed to a somewhat rhetorical exaggeration, we shall not be disposed to think that the Parisian women are here proved to be worse off than the London women. Indeed, so many more situations are open to women in France than in England, factory labour excepted, that we should have looked to find the women there

better paid than they are here; *i. e.*, in proportion to men's wages. Parisian washerwomen, dyers, polishers, and some others, earn from 1*s.* 9*d.* to 2*s.* 3*d.* a day, though frequently with a long dead season.

Among men, we find blacksmiths, slaters, bakers, plumbers, varnishers, earning 3*s.* 6*d.* to 4*s.* a day; generally with a dead season of three or four months. But we may suppose that at the worst of times all get something; perhaps half wages. Harness-makers are said to be paid under 2*s.* a day: hairdressers 8*d.* a day with poor board and lodging. The common labourer gets about 2*s.*

There is nothing at all remarkable in these rates. They are 6*d.* to 1*s.* a day less than those of London. On comparing them with those which prevail in the country parts of France, they are higher than we might have anticipated. When we find a country labourer in Auvergne or Brittany living on 9*d.* a day; or when we remember that, before the famine, an Irishman was resigned to 6*d.* a day; we are disposed to regard the Parisian as comparatively affluent. Yet hear the rhetorician's comments. "How many tears does each of these cyphers represent! what cries of anguish! what cares violently driven down into the abysses of the heart! Such however, is the condition of the people of Paris, the city of science and of art, the radiant capital of the civilized world; a city, in truth, whose physiognomy exhibits but too faithfully all the hideous contrasts of a boasted civilization: superb promenades and muddy roads, glittering shops

and gloomy workshops, theatres for singing and obscene places for weeping, monuments for the triumphant and receptacles for the drowned, the *Arc de l'Etoile* and the *Morgue* !” All this invective may be true enough, but it does not by any means arise logically from the list of wages paid to the different labourers.

Louis Blanc afterwards carries his readers to Troyes, and he gives them results of inquiries made by himself at that town. He found wages far lower than in Paris: carpenters earning only 1s. 6d. to 2s.; shoemakers 1s. to 1s. 6d., and bootmakers, 1s. 8d. to 2s. 1d.; masons, 1s. 6d. to 2s. 1d.; weavers, 7½d., 1s. 3d., 1s. 8d. by 13 or 14 hours’ work. Such is the “excess of misery to which the cowardly and brutal principle of competition has reduced the people.”

Then we have a sketch of other miseries: of persons prepared for vice by ignorance and driven into it by want; of the professional thieves, swindlers, prostitutes, and bullies; of an army of upwards of sixty thousand ill-doers in Paris alone; of foul lodgings let at a penny a night; of the lepers of the moral world with fierce and bestial countenances, speaking a pestilent language unknown to decency; of orgies where in brutal quarrels blood is often mingled with wine; of all those unclean and unmentionable things which end in the galleys and the guillotine.

No doubt, such things are; and not in Paris alone, but in every metropolis, in every large town of the world. But are we to be told that these obscene doings are the result of low wages and of competition? Will

anyone be audacious enough to say that if we could give a competent income to every family to-day, there would not be to-morrow, a host of idlers and debauchees incapable of work as of frugality? I grant that these men and women, if they had had our training, would have conducted themselves as we conduct ourselves; with decency, and self-denial, and industry. But they have not had our training, and you cannot give it them. And what is worse; their children are now, while we are talking, receiving the same evil education that misled the parents, and no means have been devised to stop the hereditary current of iniquity. It goes down, an heir-loom, from father to son. And you propose to correct the evil by raising wages? by abolishing competition? You must needs find a sharper remedy than that, if you would root out evil from the world.

But, says Louis Blanc, matters are growing worse. Formerly "crime was brutal, solitary, individual: now murderers and robbers organize themselves; they submit to discipline; they have a code of laws of honour; they act in bands and by virtue of calculated combinations. The *cour d'assises* lately, has dragged before the public the *Charpentier* band, which had declared war against moderate fortunes; the *Courvoisier* band, which had systematised the pillage of the *faubourg St. Germain*; the *Gauthier Pérez* band, which plundered the savings of workmen; and the bands of the *Auvergnats*, the *Endormeurs*, the *Etrangleurs*. Force, refused admission into the dominion of labour, passes into the camp of crime. . . . while we hesitate to organize

an association of labourers, we behold an organized association of assassins.

"Such disorder is intolerable and needs a termination. But if the result freezes us with horror, let us at least mount to the causes. Properly speaking there is but one cause and that is misery."

To give force and poignancy to the argument, a case of actual life is given. "On the 12th July, 1844, the procureur-général, Hébert, indicted Chevreuil for the murder of his wife, on the ground of his own confession spontaneously made and strengthened by circumstantial details. Chevreuil stated that the deceased, Cœlina Annette Brown, had cohabited with him a month: that being unhappy and weary of a life which their indigence rendered intolerable, they had agreed to die together: that to carry out their resolution, they had drunk some brandy, had shut and caulked their window, and had provided the charcoal to stifle themselves with. Cœlina Brown had laid down and Chevreuil had said to her, 'We shall soon die.' 'Yes, yes,' replied she, sobbing: 'wait a bit.' Hysterics followed, but the accused calmed her with some water. She then said, 'You are going to die, my dear Julien; you have lighted the charcoal, let us go to sleep.' She then fell asleep. However the charcoal was not yet lighted. The accused said he feared that in her hysterics the deceased might fall on the fire and be burned. At the instant it occurred to him that he would suffocate her. Being excited with the brandy, he melted some wax, spread it on a cloth, and closed her mouth and nostrils. In a few instants

she was dead. Chevreuil says that he had not courage to light the charcoal, or to commit suicide otherwise, but that he hurried to the station to surrender to the police."

"This poor girl," says Louis Blanc, "was of no vulgar nature, as it appears from the evidence. One day she said to her lover: 'I will tell you some of my ideas. When I was younger I worked at St. Maur; and on fine evenings I rambled alone into the fields towards the *voûte St. Maur*, to a charming place where I was surrounded by verdure and flowers. There, often have I wept at my own fancies. A drama called *Ketly* which I had seen at the *Gymnase*, haunted me. Among the characters was a woman who sincerely loved; and I in my solitude, I, like this woman, loved a supernatural being whom I knew not, whom I saw not; but to whom I spoke, in whose presence I believed, who slept by my side. Then I gathered flowers and scattered them around him, and I whispered, he is there, my faithful one. Oh, yes! I loved well, I wept, I was happy in my visions, and every day I renewed them.'

"What depth of sentiment! what ideality! what a touching mixture of passion and reverie! What a fund of gentle sadness! But Cœlina Brown was destined to wretchedness: her soul was soon degraded and consumed. She sought in intoxication shameful excitements and a fatal delirium; and at last, finding life too burdensome, she said to her lover, 'You are about to die, my dear Julien; let us go to sleep.'"

Certainly, this little drama of actual life, this terrible reality of the police court, is very affecting; and the more so because it is only one of a thousand cases constantly recurring. But we must needs turn from it, and be cold enough to ask what it teaches as to our present inquiry.

If I understand Louis Blanc's argument, it is this: there is in the world a great deal of squalid misery and of revolting crime; the crime springs inevitably from the misery; both are caused by the insufficient maintenance doled out to labourers; this insufficiency is the result of competition among workmen for employment, and a consequent low rate of wages. Therefore abolish competition, give to every one a fair day's wage for a fair day's work; you will then see misery and crime disappear.

That poverty is sometimes a cause of crime cannot be doubted. There are many people in the world who will live honestly if they can, but who will not live without certain enjoyments. When trade is good and wages are high, such persons will work with moderate steadiness, and will be glad to abstain from crime because they fear the consequences. An offender who had been convicted of coining base money, who had suffered his imprisonment and was again at large and at honest employment, said to me that he was very unfortunate in having been caught just then, for he should not have coined any more. I asked him what was to have cured him of his criminal habit. He replied that he never coined when he could get

regular work; that he had been doing it at that time because an accident had deprived him of his wages for some weeks; but that since then his trade had been so regular that he would not have been driven to crime. I thought his conversion to honesty was of a singularly unsatisfactory character, and it occurred to me that sooner or later in the inevitable fluctuations of business, he would certainly have relapsed. Still it cannot be denied that in this instance poverty was the occasion of crime.

But no one I suppose, would have much sympathy with such a man as I have described, who was capable of earning 2*l.* a week, and yet felt himself irresistibly urged to wickedness by a month's failure of wages. Louis Blanc however, has a meaning far deeper than this: he conceives that men and women bent on honesty, are most unwillingly forced to do wrong to save themselves from starvation. Such things are, no doubt, and deeply are they to be deplored. A woman whose husband neglects her, a girl whose father behaves brutally to her, a child that has no parents or none that love him; all these may be pressed into the service of crime, and may beg, steal, or do almost worse, to stave off cold and hunger. You may say that poverty causes their crimes. I should say that the wickedness of their relations causes their crimes. There is destitution it is true, but it is destitution caused by iniquity not by poverty. Will any amount of wages prevent such cases? Certainly not. In vain you would abolish competition, and furnish employment to all, and give to everyone a liberal wage: so long as selfishness, drunkenness, brutality, and

dissolute habits, are found, so long will there be these deplorable cases of want and consequent crime.

That crime generally, is caused by destitution, I can by no means concede. People steal in order to satisfy some desire, sometimes to satisfy the innocent desire for necessary food and clothing, but far more often to satisfy the craving for unnecessary pleasure, and above all to supply the means of drunkenness and dissipation. Of the offences against the law with which I have been brought into contact, few indeed have been defended on the ground of necessity. Here and there a poor girl has been charged with filching a loaf, or a man with purloining a pound of meat, and it has been urged in mitigation that the poverty and not the will consented ; but such cases are altogether exceptional. In England indeed, the answer to such an excuse is always ready : why did you not go to the poorhouse ? In France there is no poorhouse.

If crime were generally the result of poverty caused by low wages, we ought to find an absence of crime where wages are high, as in the United States and in Canada. I say nothing of Australia, because the long continued transportation of convicts may be thought to have vitiated the people there. But in North America people are not absolutely virtuous. To pass over the people of colour, who are degraded by the humiliations heaped upon them, the whites and even the native whites, are guilty of offences against the law. Every man can earn, if he will work, a competent maintenance, such as in England would be thought liberal, and in

France would be thought profuse. Whence then, in the face of plenty, if crime be usually the child of destitution, springs the swarm of American misdoers? It is notorious that lawlessness stalks abroad more audaciously than in any great town of Europe: that pick-pockets, cut-purses, swindlers, burglars, practise their abominable trades, with as much success and far greater impunity than are found among ourselves. Away then, with the notion that by raising the rate of wages you will extinguish crime!

But competition, according to Louis Blanc, leads to many other disastrous consequences besides low wages. Competition indeed, he says, is but one result of individualism, and to individualism he is a declared enemy. From this source spring avarice and a penurious disposition. That it is in itself a good thing for the lower classes to save he cannot deny, but he conceives that undue praise has been lavished on the institution of savings' banks.

In the first place, these banks are open to all; to the servant who has robbed his master or to the prostitute who has made a market of her charms, as much as to the honest mechanic or prudent clerk. If it were the custom in such banks to receive goods as well as money, I could understand the objection, because facilities might thus be given for getting rid of stolen property; though it seems highly improbable that such property should be brought to a public establishment. But when a thief has succeeded in converting his booty into money, it is no injury to society that he should have the opportunity

of lodging it securely; nor do I think it likely that men of criminal habits will be ready to deposit in a public bank the proceeds of a robbery, because their possession of money at a given time is a *prima facie* proof of guilt. All such men are anxious to conceal their possessions.

In another objection urged, the republican peeps out. The savings' banks are injurious because they cause a servility to the ruling powers. A poor man who has a deposit of a hundred francs, or a clerk whose hard savings of a thousand francs are at stake, will for his own sake be disposed to support the existing government, bad as it may be. It is the wretched whom you must select to lead a forlorn hope, not the full-fed man to whom the world and the world's law are friends. Would you render the depositors fit subjects for revolution? Shut up the savings' banks, confiscate their treasures, proclaim to the creditors that they are undone; then you may reckon on these destitute men as reckless and careless of law and order. Louis Blanc is wise in his generation, so far as a just appreciation of means constitutes wisdom. The savings' banks are conservative institutions: they do tend to make men tolerant even of misgovernment, and indisposed to rush perpetually into the streets crying, Down with the government. Those who, with Louis Blanc, regard a republic as the summum bonum, who will cheerfully go through twenty revolutions to attain one commonwealth, will, as he does, "hesitate dislike" to savings' banks. But those who regard a revolution as a frightful evil only to be encountered in case of absolute

necessity, who will bear almost any amount of temporary misgovernment rather than have recourse to arms, who will exhaust every peaceable means of redress before they disturb the minds of men by joining in measures of violence, will think of France, not as a country in which an excess of servility is to be apprehended, but as one in which a volatile and reckless spirit renders desirable every institution tending to order and stability. What to Louis Blanc is an objection, is to them a strong recommendation.

But further; a disposition to save tends to dry up the sources of kindness, generosity, charity. Since it has been conceded just before that it is an excellent thing for the lower classes to save, this objection is nothing more than a repetition of the trite sayings, that no good is without some drawback of evil, and that even virtues carried to excess become vices. If we were to canvass the characters of a thousand workmen, we should probably find a certain number of frugal men, who are also selfish and hard-hearted. We should also find a certain number who are at once profuse and hard-hearted. Both these classes are equally selfish; both equally intent upon getting money whether for saving or spending. Let the two classes change places, the penurious becoming lavish, and the lavish penurious: would they be the less selfish, the less bent on getting money each for their own good? It has been observed by Taylor that only "frugal men are truly liberal," and one thing is manifest, that none but those who deny themselves can assist others. It can scarcely be disputed

that among the educated classes, it is the hard-working self-denying men of the middle ranks, and not the heirs to hereditary estates, who do most liberal things for the public. We need not at present fear to encourage a prudent disposition among labourers, even though here and there, it should be connected with parsimony and avarice.

The French, says Louis Blanc, have borrowed from England the system of free competition. We are now speaking of competition of one workman with another; and it is hard to say in what civilized nation this kind of competition does not exist. In a portion of the United States indeed, there is slavery; in Russia there is serfage; among the Arabs there is a sort of family communism, extending to two or three generations, grandfather, father, and married children. In other countries as Germany, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Spain, Italy, there is competition just as in France. Why then, should it be said that this competition of workmen with each other, is borrowed from England?

The reason for fixing upon us as the type seems to be, that one institution exists here, which follows naturally enough from free competition, and which the French shrink from with alarm: I mean the poor-laws. If individualism, competition, and low wages, are to result in a poor-law, the French recoil from the consequence. They have always heard our poor-law railed at, denounced as vicious in principle and ruinous in practice, causing more destitution than it relieves, and persevered in only through that obstinate adherence to

precedent which distinguishes the self-willed and rather stupid Saxon race.

Louis Blanc shares or panders to this prepossession. After quoting from Bulwer, to the effect that the criminal is better fed in prison than the pauper in the workhouse, and that the pauper is better fed than the self-supported labourer (assertions true enough formerly), he adds, "This is monstrous, is it not? Well, it is necessary. England has labourers, but fewer labourers than inhabitants. As there is no medium between feeding the paupers and killing them, the English legislators have chosen the former; they had not the courage of the Emperor Galerius: that is all. It remains to be seen whether the French legislators will coolly embrace these abominable consequences of the industrial régime which they have borrowed from England. Competition produces misery: a fact proved by figures. Destitution is frightfully prolific: a fact proved by figures. The fecundity of the poor casts into society wretches who want work and cannot get it: a fact proved by figures. At this point, society has no option but to kill the poor or feed them gratuitously: atrocity or folly."

We might have supposed that we had now done with competition and its consequences. No such thing. Louis Blanc at every step finds new and painful results: Alps upon Alps arise. If the lower classes suffer, so do the middle classes; and that not merely by sympathy with those beneath them, but also directly in their own interests. Cheapness, says Louis Blanc, is

the great advantage proposed as the result of competition. It cannot be denied that cheapness is in itself a good thing, but it is a characteristic of a bad principle to corrupt an advantage into an evil; and under the action of competition, cheapness itself becomes a curse. We naturally inquire with some curiosity how this comes about. The explanation offered is, that the cheapness is only temporary; that the producers by whose competition the price of a commodity is lowered, go on struggling forward in the race until one or more of them are ruined, and that then prices rise higher than ever. An illustration of this process is given in the case of a rivalry between the *messageries Laffitte* and others, which led to an action at law that placed the whole system before the public.

The ground of proceeding was that two companies had conspired together to ruin a third, by lowering prices unduly. The French law condemns such a combination as a conspiracy. Here, says M. Louis Blanc, what an inconsistency! Two persons, each with a hundred thousand francs, are forbidden to join in driving out of the market a third person as rich as themselves; but if one person possessed of two hundred thousand francs chooses to use that sum in driving out of the market the same third person, only half as rich as himself, that is a legal proceeding. It may fairly be replied that the cases in which a person does choose to do such a thing as this, are so rare that it is not worth while for the law to interfere; just as in the case of English husband and wife, where the husband may

leave all his property to strangers; but the law does not interfere, because the wrong is a most uncommon one, and hard to correct without injurious consequences. There are in the world a thousand vices with which the law meddles not, because it cannot meddle with any probability of benefit. But if you allow persons to combine together to crush a particular person, that combination may not be limited to two or three; it may extend to ten or twenty: it may have a capital of a million, or ten million francs: it may embrace a whole kingdom in its operations. Whether it would be prudent for the law to interfere even in such an exaggerated case as this, Englishmen would be inclined to doubt.

But the real answer to the illustration is that it is altogether exceptional, and does not represent what actually happens in ordinary branches of industry. The owners of certain lines of diligences on the great roads, combine together to obtain a monopoly; and in order to accomplish this, they reduce their fares below cost price so as to ruin an interloper or drive him off the road. The public afterwards pay a higher price in consequence of the monopoly. The evil then, is that in this case there is ultimately a want of free competition. But in how many departments of business is such a combination possible? In the production of grain or cattle? Certainly not. In the manufacture of cloths, of calicoes, of iron, of hardware, of jewellery? In none of these. In the importation of timber, of tobacco, of sugar, tea, coffee? No one will pretend that such is the case. The whole notion is an absurdity.

It is just the same when we are told, that though under competition and low prices, consumption increases for a time, yet that afterwards the consumption again diminishes and falls lower than ever: we feel at once that whatever instance may be brought to back up such an opinion, the rule is altogether the other way. When people of small means are warned that under unlimited competition they are liable to be crushed, driven out of their occupation, or swallowed up by leviathan competitors, they remember that it is unlimited competition which has given them their small means; and that no change has taken place such as to deprive them of what they have accumulated or to prevent their little fortune from growing. It is notorious that in a fair field the young and active man who has his way to make, is more than a match for the rich man of extensive business, who must leave the details of his concerns to paid agents. All who have had experience in affairs, know that underselling and low prices come from below not from above; from those who are seeking a standing-place, not from those who have secured one. It is the beginner, not the established man of business who is aggressive. The whole of Louis Blanc's arguments on this subject, savour too much of the student, who knows life by conjecture rather than by experience. If he had been acquainted with one fact, which cannot be disputed, that in English manufacturing towns the successful men of business have generally risen from the ranks, or are the sons of such men, he would scarcely have adopted such whimsical notions

as to the results of competition among the middle classes.

It might have been thought that one part of the social organization of France would have given Louis Blanc unmixed pleasure: the extreme subdivision of land seems peculiarly fitted to gratify so determined a republican, so fierce an enemy of rank and privilege. But in Louis Blanc's creed, whatever is, is wrong. The *morcellement* of French territory is in many respects a misfortune in the eyes of Englishmen. Even in a political point of view, those who are enemies to very large properties, who regret the impossibility of a modified agrarian law, who would gladly see a limit of a few thousands a year set to the possessions of every family; such men, in spite of republican or philosophical prepossessions, deplore the subdivision of the French soil as a source of political weakness. But they would scarcely expect to find Louis Blanc on their side.

The grounds however, of his objection to this practice, are not political. He fears that if care is not taken, the present excessive partition will lead to the reconstitution of large properties. He does not show how this is to happen, but leaves us to suppose that it will follow according to the common maxim that extremes follow each other. He adds with far more force, that the subdivision of land implies farming on a small scale; that is, the spade in place of the plough, routine in place of science. Machines and capital are banished. But without machines there can be no improvement; without capital there can be no cattle.

He conceives that farming on a large scale must hereafter absorb this minute cultivation, though as to the how this is to happen he leaves us in the dark.

Besides this, we are told, the little proprietor is not much better than a serf. If he works on his own land two days a week, the other four days he must hire himself to a neighbour. And as his land increases he becomes less his own master. For how does it increase? A man who possesses a few acres, has an opportunity of adding a convenient corner. He has not the purchase-money, but he can borrow it. His farm, even cultivated by himself, yields him not more than four per cent.: he borrows at a usurious interest of ten, fifteen, twenty per cent. The consequences are manifest, and the extent of the mischief is marked by the fact, that the realty of France is charged with mortgages to the extent of five hundred and twenty millions sterling. I give the facts and amounts as they are here set down; though it passes my comprehension to understand why a man borrowing on the security of land with a good title, should pay ten, fifteen, or twenty per cent. interest, while the government, and at all times an unstable government, can borrow under five per cent.

It is not easy to see in what way this question of land tenure connects itself with that of competition. Louis Blanc however, was desirous of alarming all classes, and of showing them that under the existing régime there was no hope for them. The working classes were continually sinking into greater depths of misery. The middle classes were ruining each other in towns

by competition : and if they looked to the country and imagined that subdivision of land would save them, they were utterly mistaken. In the one case certain capitalists render themselves masters of the industrious, in the other case, usurers are getting possession of the soil. Thus the bourgeoisie proceeds to its dissolution both in town and country. Everything is menacing, undermining, and ruining it.

I have already remarked with regard to towns, that it is not true as to England at least, that there is a tendency on the part of great capitalists to crush the little ones ; but that on the contrary, it is the beginners and the smaller capitalists who are constantly encroaching on the larger and longer established concerns, and reducing their profits. With regard also to the country, there is a fallacy implied in the above reasoning. Some years ago, when questions about currency were much discussed, one of the partizans of an indefinite inconvertible currency, maintained that the middle classes were all of them on the road to ruin. It was urged on him that his own town was fast increasing ; that new manufactories were springing up, new dwelling houses of an expensive construction in the course of erection. That was true he said, but these were hollow signs, for that every building was mortgaged. But who lent the money on mortgage ? Was not the property there just as surely, whether it belonged to me the builder, or to you the mortgagee, or partly to both of us ? So in this case of French land : say it is mortgaged ; who lends the money ? One of the middle classes no doubt : one

who prefers a good security, before an actual possession. It may be an unfortunate habit, that of buying and borrowing: but I do not see how the class of the bourgeoisie can be endangered by it, unless we suppose that the lenders are either noblemen or workmen, an aggravation that is not alleged. If the weight of certain great capitalists is feared, we must remember that their property of every sort, is divided at death among their children.

SECTION III.—The proposed remedy—Brevity of Louis Blanc's explanation—National workshops to be originated by Government—The folly of the notion—Effect on middle classes—Louis Blanc's apology—A union of towns as well as of trades—Central corporation of each trade—Union of different trades—Illustration by Post-office—Provision for the destitute—A poor-law really wanted—The question of machinery.

In the previous section I have explained the objections entertained by Louis Blanc against competition; and I now proceed to discuss the remedy he proposes. One very startling circumstance presents itself at once: I mean the singular brevity of the development of this remedy. We are asked to abolish a system established for centuries in every civilized nation; to remove from workmen the responsibility of providing themselves with employment and support; to do away with the relation of capitalist and labourer; to establish a new mode of maintaining the working classes; to put a public body in the place of merchant and manufac-

turer. And the whole system by which it is proposed to accomplish this critical and alarming change, is comprised in less than twenty duodecimo pages of a declamatory book. If we could imagine Jeremy Bentham taking up so wild a cause, we should be certain that not twenty pages, nor twenty volumes, would exhaust the subject. He would have investigated every point at which the master under the present régime touches the workman; he would have anxiously and minutely inquired into every relation existing between them; and he would have endeavoured to show how substitutes would be found in the new organization. He would have provided checks and counterchecks against abuses on the part of the overlookers and abuses on the part of the men. He would have had divisions and subdivisions without end, and would have coined a new and uncouth language to express with precision the novel relations he desired to create. But Louis Blanc is satisfied with seventeen short pages.

He begins thus: "Government should be regarded as the supreme regulator of production, and that it might accomplish its task, should be invested with great power.

"This task consists in availing itself of competition itself in order to banish competition.

"Government should raise a loan, which should be applied to the erection of *social workshops* in the most important branches of national industry.

"This erection requiring a considerable outlay, the number of original workshops should be rigorously

limited ; but in virtue of their very organization, as we shall see afterwards, they will have a power of immense expansion.

“ The Government being looked upon as the only founder of the *social workshops*, it must also frame the statutes. The body of statutes discussed and passed by the national representation, will have the form and power of law.

“ The persons to be called to labour in the *social workshops*, with certain limitations, shall be all workmen who give pledges of morality.

“ As the false and antisocial education given to the present generation, does not allow us to look to anything but a difference of remuneration as a means of emulation and encouragement, the difference of wages should be graduated according to the hierarchy of functions ; a new education being expected to change the ideas and manners as to this point. It is unnecessary to say that the wages ought in every case to furnish a liberal maintenance.

“ During the first year that follows the establishment of these workshops, the Government should regulate the hierarchy of functions. After the first year a change should be made. The workmen having had time to appreciate each other, and all being, as we shall see, equally interested in the success of the association, the hierarchy should spring from the principle of election.

“ An account to be taken every year of the net profit, and this to be divided into three parts : the one to be distributed equally among the members ; another

to be set apart: 1st, for the maintenance of the old, sick, and infirm; 2ndly, for the mitigation of a crisis which may occur in other branches; each branch being bound to assist every other; the third portion to be applied to purchase new instruments of labour for those who would desire to join the association, so that it may be extended indefinitely.

“Into each of these associations formed for wholesale business, there might be admitted persons whose avocations compel them to scatter themselves and to hold themselves aloof; so that every social workshop might contain various avocations grouped round one wholesale business; different parts of one whole, obeying the same laws and participating in the same advantages.

“Every member should be at liberty to dispose of his wages at his pleasure; but the evident economy and incontestable excellence of living in common, would not be long in converting the association of labours into a voluntary association of wants and pleasures.

“Capitalists would be invited into the association, and would receive interest on the principal invested, which interest would be guaranteed to them out of the budget; but they would share the profits, only in the character of labourers.”

Such are the fundamental principles of Louis Blanc's scheme, and those who have read an account of St. Simon's and of Fourier's plans, will say that there is nothing very new or striking. The same community of interest, the same partition of profits. The mode of electing the “hierarchy of functions” is different, but

the economical or business part has the same general features. Louis Blanc goes on to utter a song of triumph over his anticipated success.

"The social workshop once set going, the result is easily seen. In every leading trade, that of machinery for example, or that of cotton, silk, printing, there would be a social workshop competing with a private business. Would the contest be a long one? No: because the social workshop would have over every private business, the advantage which results from living in common, and from a mode of organization in which all the workmen have an interest in quick and excellent production."

It is really unnecessary to comment on such loose statements, of which the errors are glaring. The production in common, and the living in common are things altogether distinct, and Louis Blanc proposes before that the living in common should be introduced gradually, each workman being at liberty to spend his wages as he pleases. From my knowledge of workmen and my experience of their extreme tenacity of habits once formed, I would venture to prophecy that whatever advantages might be held out by living in common, any attempt to induce them to give up their separate households, would be a failure. Besides, this living in common is just as applicable to men employed by private persons, as to men working in the social workshops.

Put aside then the life in common, and say whether social workshops could undersell private manufacturers,

so as to compel them to shut up their establishments. It is almost trifling to attempt to prove what all common sense and all experience agree in concluding: that a communistic establishment has no chance of success against individual enterprise. Any one who will notice the way in which profits are commonly made will have no hesitation on this matter. You and I are engaged in the same trade, and apparently with equal advantages and equal industry: you make a handsome income, I barely live. Note the differences between us. We work equally hard, but you do everything at the right moment, while I do the thing that happens to suit my fancy. Your letters are answered the day they are received, but mine are allowed to accumulate: your correspondents therefore, are pleased, and mine are perpetually grumbling. You attend at once to any orders sent you, and thus you achieve punctuality; but I lose days at starting and am always behindhand. You are obliging and considerate to buyers, I am touchy and exacting. These differences are quite enough to account for your commanding a higher price than I can get. Punctuality and good temper are very merchantable commodities.

The same method runs through all parts of your business, the same want of method vitiates all parts of mine. You collect your accounts regularly and therefore you can pay your accounts regularly. We have each of us the same capital, but yours being kept better in hand goes farther. You buy for cash and I buy upon credit: you pay on the appointed day

and I can never be depended upon to fulfil a promise: you can always meet an unexpected demand, oblige by occasionally paying in advance, or buy any bargain that is fairly offered: while I can hardly stretch my means to pay my way. Besides, the good-temper that you show to your customers, you extend to those you buy from: and as these people know that though you buy low you never buy shabbily, that you pay every penny which is due, and season the whole with gentle and courteous behaviour, they will always sell to you in preference to me: you will have the pickings and I the refuse. I say nothing of other points such as the mode of keeping accounts, or the knack of avoiding bad debts. If in these respects you and I are equal, the differences I have already pointed out are quite sufficient to account for the fact that where you realize a fortune I starve.

Where are the good qualities I have pointed out, more likely to be found? In a business carried on in a social workshop, or in one carried on by an individual? In a business where the correspondence and arrangements are managed on by a man for the benefit of others as well as himself, or in one where everything is done by a man for his own benefit? In a business where the motives to activity and good-temper are weak, or in one where those motives are strong? The question answers itself. I can imagine an institution of social workshops in my own town, and I shudder at the notion of having dealings with it. I apply to the managers for prices, and instead of getting an answer

in an hour I wait two or three days for one. I send an order : I receive a reply that I must wait a month, and at the end of two months I am supplied. If I complain I am told that the delay was inevitable and that it is of no use to grumble. Even large private establishments are generally very unmanageable, and labour under great disadvantages, as compared with smaller concerns, but joint-stock companies are worst of all. Who will ever employ a railway company as a carrier when he can get a being of flesh and blood to undertake his deliveries ? Most unfounded is the notion that national workshops would drive private enterprise out of the field.

It cannot be supposed that this scheme would be palatable to the middle classes, because it threatens them with a government opposition at first and entire absorption afterwards. Now if a joint-stock company is established to enter into competition with me, however certain I may be that it will not absorb me but that the company will end in ruin, I yet feel it a hardship that my prices should be lowered and my business diminished, by a proceeding that cannot benefit any one. But if this opposition is to spring from Government, to be carried on with the bottomless purse of loans and taxes, and free from the checks which accompany all other undertakings, I feel myself doubly aggrieved. Louis Blanc is not without consciousness of this difficulty, and he shall apologize for it in his own words.

“ Will power constituted as we desire, have any interest in upsetting industry and disturbing all ex-

istences? Will it not be by nature and position, the born protector even of those with whom, with the intention of transforming society, it will enter into a holy competition? Between then, the industrial war which a rich capitalist now declares against a little capitalist, and that which power would declare, in our system, against an individual, there is no comparison possible. The former necessarily consecrates fraud, violence, and all the miseries that iniquity carries with it; the latter would be carried on without brutality, without shocks, and in such a way as merely to attain the end of the successive absorption of individual workshops by social workshops." I must again protest against the assertion that ordinary competition is carried on by fraud, violence, and iniquity. That there is fraud committed in trade and commerce, cannot be denied; just as it cannot be denied that there is lying, hypocrisy, and fraud, among professional men. That commercial morality is as high as it ought to be, it would be most unsafe to assert; just as it would be unsafe to assert that lawyers are immaculate, that doctors never sponge on their patients, that priests never unholily practise on their flocks, that politicians never deceive their constituents. But I have not found by experience that there is more deceit or fraud among educated men engaged in business, than among educated men who are lawyers, surgeons, priests, or politicians. Besides, under the proposed national system, the managers of the proposed workshops are to conduct the business entrusted to them, at least as well as

private persons conduct their business: but in order to attain this success they must take the same interest in the affairs placed in their hands that is taken by private persons in their own affairs; and this keen interest so felt will lead to the adoption of all means at hand for crushing their opponents the private traders: there will be on the part of the public managers, the same fraud, violence, and iniquity, which are supposed now to prevail.

But I wish to let Louis Blanc tell his own tale. "Thus, instead of being, as every great capitalist is at present, the master and tyrant of the market, the government would be its regulator. It would use the arm of competition, not to violently overthrow private industry, a thing it is peculiarly interested to avoid, but to lead it insensibly to a compromise. In a short time, in fact, in every branch of industry in which a social workshop had been established, it would be found that labourers and capitalists would crowd to the new establishment, on account of the advantages accruing to the members. At the end of a certain interval, there would be seen to arise, without usurpation, without injustice, without irreparable disasters, and to the profit of the principle of association, the phenomenon which at present arises so deplorably and by force of tyranny, to the profit of individual selfishness. A very rich man of business at present, by striking a heavy blow against his rivals, may leave them dead on the place, and thus monopolise a branch of industry. In our system, the State would become master of industry

gradually, and instead of monopoly, we should have obtained as the result of success the destruction of competition: association." To suppose that capitalists would flock to an establishment, where from masters they would sink into servants, is as absurd as the rest of the apology. The whole scheme is well adapted to allure the workmen, because a high rate of wages would be given at once, with a hope of a share of profit afterwards: but as to the masters, it must be *caviare* to them.

The scheme is as yet incomplete, since various branches of manufacture are carried on in many places at once. Machinery must be made to some extent in every large town; not only in Paris, but also in Lyons, Elbœuf, Marseilles, Amiens, and a score of other localities. But, as Louis Blanc says, it would be absurd, after having extinguished competition among individuals, to leave it at work among corporations. To obviate this, there must be a central corporation for each trade, with other minor corporations affiliated to it throughout the kingdom. Just as M. Rothschild possesses an establishment in Paris, another in London, a third in Vienna, and others in many great cities, so should every branch of trade have a central workshop and other establishments subordinate to it.

Louis Blanc piques himself on the simplicity of his invented organization. The government he thinks, would really have very little to do; since after the first year, each workshop would be complete in itself, and the action of the central power would be limited to super-

intending the correspondence between the distant establishments in each trade, and in preventing the violation of the common regulations. To illustrate this we are told to imagine that the carrying of letters had been left to private persons, and that Government had suddenly determined to establish a post-office and to engross the business of delivery. What difficulties would have been suggested! How would it be possible for a government to undertake the transport and distribution of the letters of thirty-four millions of people? Yet in fact, how utterly futile such objections would have been; since experience shows us that a government can and does deliver all this correspondence with beautiful precision. Had Louis Blanc read more on such matters as these, he would have known by old observation, that there are a few businesses which a corporation, and therefore a government, can carry on, and a far greater number which are quite outside its competency. A corporate body may carry on a bank, or a gas-company, or a railroad, or water-works, but it cannot profitably conduct a manufactory, or a mercantile business, or a retail shop. A government may administer a post-office, but how should we like to trust it to furnish our bread, our meat, our clothes? It might possibly carry on the business of miller, of baker, of butcher: but we are all of us certain that it is safer to trust to individual enterprise.

Then again, it is urged, a government manages an army: Napoleon had under his orders a million of men. "It is true that the question then was one of destruc-

tion. But is it in the nature of things, and the will of God, and the providential destiny of societies, that to produce in common is impossible, when it is so easy to destroy in common?" It is a curious phenomenon that in all these social and communistic effusions, whether of St. Simon, or of Fourier's disciples, or of Louis Blanc, there is this same appeal to the intentions of the Deity. It is in a milder form the same argument: God is good: therefore he cannot intend us to suffer or die; therefore pain and death may be banished: and it is our own fault if we do not enjoy perfect health, and immunity from death. Let those who please, be imposed upon with such argumentation. Then again: destruction in common is possible; therefore production in common is possible. No one doubts the possibility: it is only the advantageousness that is questioned.

One step more is necessary to complete the system. We are now provided with a central workshop in machinery, in cotton-spinning, in making silk goods, in iron smelting, in pottery, in carpentry, in tailoring, in shoe-making, in a thousand branches of trade; and around each of these thousand central workshops revolve a score, a hundred, or a thousand affiliated workshops. Here, one would suppose, is a very sufficient amount of complexity. To a sober-minded man it appears distressing to think that an hour wasted by an idle shoe-maker in Troyes, should cause a loss to an industrious shoemaker in Amiens or Marseilles; and that each man has a right to demand an account of every piece of leather and every ball of wax used in

all the cobblers' stalls among thirty-four millions of people. But this does not satisfy Louis Blanc's aggregating tendencies. He will not be contented without uniting in the bonds of community, every artizan with every other artizan. It appears to him that nothing is done, so long as only every shoemaker has a community of interest with every other shoemaker, and every machinist with every other machinist. To satisfy his capacious desires, every shoemaker shall fraternise with every shoemaker, and each of these with every tailor or machinist, and in short, every mechanic with every other mechanic of whatsoever trade. Not only is each business to have its members leagued together, but each business is to be leagued with every other business. To any one familiar with affairs, it is bewildering to think of the complexity of the national accounts, which must be kept with such accuracy that I, a Parisian shoemaker, shall be assigned each year, besides my wages, a share in the profit arising from the labour of every shoemaker and tailor in Paris, in Alsace, in Brittany; of every machinist in Paris, in Elbœuf, in Amiens; of every silk thrower or weaver in Lyons; to say nothing of a thousand other places and a hundred other trades. Such a proposition seems to show that Louis Blanc is extremely ignorant, extremely reckless, or both ignorant and reckless. Possibly, his scheme struck out at a heat, and published without reflection, assumed an unexpected importance in his own eyes, because, falling in with the popular current of thought, it attracted public attention.

Louis Blanc has cited the post-office as an example to show the competency of a government for carrying on business. That service as conducted in England according to the amended scheme of Mr. Rowland Hill, is very simple in its principle; the greater part of the money being received by the sale of stamps. The money-order department even, is capable of being carried on by a routine which any one can control, when the system is once set to work. But in former times, when the postage was varied according to distance of conveyance, when letters were charged 1*d.*, 2*d.*, 4*d.*, 9*d.*, 1*s.*, and upwards, and when pre-payments were unusual, the accounts of the service were not nearly so simple as at present; and if we may believe the statements made, great irregularities prevailed. Yet even at that time, the business carried on by a minor office was scarcely more complex than that of a baker or grocer; and the business carried on by an office in a great town, required far less precision, and none of the vigour or judgment, necessary to conduct with success a mercantile, or even a retail business. If a government could not carry on the old post-offices with anything like accuracy, what figure would it make if all the concerns of the country were transferred to it? But to argue the question at all is a waste of time.

This new system of universal community being assumed to be possible, and so profitable as to absorb all private concerns, it is easy enough to show some advantages that would follow. There is of course, the provision for people in distress, through sickness or want of work.

But after all, the necessary funds for this purpose may be provided in other ways, by general taxation or local taxation. At every turn in these discussions, we come to this conclusion; that France grievously wants a poor-law, similar in principle to ours. And what would be Louis Blanc's fund for the relief of distress, but what our fund is? His would be raised by means of a complicated, inaccurate, and impossible system of national accounts, showing or attempting to show the aggregate profits of trade, and sparing the income of the owners of land and other realty: ours is raised by a tax founded on an assessment of immoveable property. And as to administration: his would be national, ours is local, but subject to the control of a central authority.

But Louis Blanc conceives further that we should get rid of the difficulties attending the vexed question of machinery. "In our present industrial world, every scientific discovery is a calamity, first, because machinery supersedes the workmen who must labour in order to live, and also because the machinery is a murderous instrument in the hand of its exclusive possessor against those who do not possess it. A new machine is in the system of competition a monopoly. But in the system of association and mutual responsibility, no more patents, no more exclusive rights. The inventor must be remunerated by the State, and his discovery placed at once within the reach of all. Thus, that which is to-day a means of extermination, would become the instrument of universal progress; that which reduces the workman to hunger, despair, and

revolt, would then only reduce the weight of his task, and give him leisure for the exercise of his intelligence. In a word, that which does permit tyranny, would then assist the triumph of fraternity."

I need not enumerate the other advantages that might be supposed to follow. I am rather disposed to reiterate my surprise, that the author of this scheme thought it possible to explain it in less than twenty short pages, one half of which are taken up with declamatory explanations of the advantages to follow. Louis Blanc must be a man singularly unacquainted with affairs if he imagined that any plan could be carried out in practice without a close attention to details.

SECTION IV—Substitute for the former plan—Division of profit among workmen—Example of this in Paris in 1843—Cases in which this might be advantageous—reasons why it would not generally answer.

While waiting for an opportunity to carry these and other wild schemes into execution, the communists cast about for a mode of doing something to exemplify their principles. Their leading notion was, that labourers should have a common interest with each other and with their employers; so that any profit remaining after paying wages and expenses, should be distributed among all engaged in production. But this might be done on a small scale as well as on a large one. A grocer might say to his shopmen and porter, at the end

of the year I will give each of you a tenth of my profits: a merchant might say to each of his clerks, I will give to each of you a twentieth of my profits: a manufacturer might say to each of the men, women, and children he employed, I will give to each of you a thousandth, a hundredth, or a fiftieth part of my profits. This notion seems to have been received in France with considerable favour, and to have been carried out with some success: and Louis Blanc at the end of his little volume, gives the particulars of an experiment made by a M. Leclaire. It is quite refreshing to find anything so practical as this, after the vague and declamatory generalities of the body of the book.

“DISTRIBUTION OF THE PROFITS OF LABOUR

“ACCOUNT FOR THE YEAR 1843.

“Maison Leclaire, Rue St George, Paris

“NOTICE.—As perhaps some persons may misunderstand our motives in the present speculation, we think it useful to give some explanation.

“When the head of a concern is desirous of retiring from business, his attention is directed to three points: first, the sale of his goodwill; secondly, the investment of the proceeds of the sale; thirdly, and this is not the least important, an employment to relieve the tedium of his expected leisure.

“Many men of business, and especially among builders, are attached to their concerns: long before abandoning them they look out for a worthy successor: if they have a son, their first thought is of him; but

the education the son has perhaps received, and a possible natural unfitness, may have led him to other pursuits.

"A son, in fact, seldom succeeds his father as a builder. What then, is to be done? Where is a purchaser to be found? And the larger the business the greater the difficulty. None but a rich man can buy, and the temptation to a rich man is small. The sale is commonly made to a clever workman. But who does not know the drawbacks attending such a transaction with a man of no means? Often has it happened that builders who have retired on such terms, have found it necessary again and again to resume the management: if examples were needed, the difficulty would be in the selection.

"But even if the retiring builder effects a satisfactory sale, he has still the difficulty of finding a solid investment. It is a source of constant anxiety to avoid the loss of what has been amassed by the labour of a life.

"These annoyances are enough: but they are nothing as compared with the disgust that attends an idle life, to one who has spent twenty or thirty years in an active superintendence of workmen.

"On the whole, having in view the uncertainty of such a future, one does not hesitate to attempt the realization of certain notions propounded by men vulgarly designated *Utopians*. We must add, in justice, that M. Louis Blanc is the man whom we have followed, and whose scheme, as explained in his *Organization of Labour*, we have adopted.

“The result is as follows: 1st; Instead of running the risk of selling to an insolvent, we remain at the head of an establishment which is our own handiwork; an establishment remarkable for our innovations both in tools and mode of management. 2ndly; we have a safe investment for our capital under our own eyes: how can a man’s money be more safely placed than in pledging it to those whose interest it is to work cheaply, well, and quickly? 3rdly; in remaining in business, we avoid exposing to the risks of an inexperienced and inconsiderate successor, workmen and managers who have grown old in our service, and who rival each other in zealous endeavours to lessen our trouble.

“Far from having to contrive occupations in retreat, we continue in the active life which is our element. We have besides, the pleasure of continuing our connection with persons whose confidence has done us honour.

“Lastly, as an amelioration, both physical and moral, has taken place in the condition of fifty persons, of whom thirty-five are fathers of families, not only do we rejoice in our attempt, but we devote our existence to the endeavours to extend the application of the principles to practice.

DISTRIBUTION OF PROFITS.

“The profits to be divided in 1843, amounted to about 800*l*. Fifty persons shared in them, in proportion to the wages they had received. Besides these, thirty other persons received gratuities. About 700*l*. were

thus divided to the following workmen (*in alphabetical order*):—

“*Altmeyer* worked $204\frac{1}{8}$ days: wages about 44*l.*: profit about 11*l.* Paid thus:—27th January, 1844, in goods 2*l.*; to savings’ bank 2*l.*; 8th February, as balance, 7*l.*

“*Aubert, Sen.* worked 294 $\frac{5}{8}$ days: wages about 55*l.*: profit about 14*l.* Paid thus:—27th January, 1844, in goods 2*l.*; to savings’ bank 2*l.*; 8th February, as balance, 10*l.*

“*Aubert, Peter*, worked in the same way, received wages 44*l.*: profit 11*l.*

“*Bontry*, worked in the same way, received wages 56*l.*: profit 14*l.*”

Then follow the names of the other men, each of whom received a profit equal to one-fourth of his wages; and each of whom had 2*l.* of those profits in goods, and 2*l.* paid to the savings’ bank.

M. Leclaire himself claimed 240*l.* as his salary, and 60*l.* as his share of the profits. I presume that he also received interest on his capital, and that this interest was reckoned as part of the expenses of the business before the profit was estimated.

At the time this account was printed, the scheme had been carried out at least two years; and comparing 1842 with 1843, it appears that the profits in 1843 had increased by 300*l.*: a change which M. Leclaire attributed to the intelligence developed by the private interest of each workman, and also by the greater care in the use of tools and materials.

There is something practical and reasonable in the above scheme, when compared with the ordinary notions of Louis Blanc and of the other communists. It is quite conceivable that a distribution among workmen of part of the profits of a business, might in some cases be advantageous to all parties concerned. A builder's men are not regularly under the master's eye, but are employed in one place to-day, in another place to-morrow; sometimes at the manufactory, in preparing timbers and frames, but more often on the sites of buildings in the course of erection or of repair. A hearty vigorous spirit would do much in forwarding the work in hand. Then again, a great part of such work must be paid for by the day and not by the piece. But men who labour by the day, having little motive to exertion, are apt to fall into a listless dawdling habit: and such a habit, this scheme of distributing the profits, is well calculated to correct.

But it is hardly conceivable that business generally should adapt itself to this pattern. It is said that in whale-fishing, the seamen have generally some personal interest in the adventure; and in Cornwall, and indeed in mining generally, some share of profit is assigned to foremen or *butties*. All these arrangements however, arise naturally, and being found advantageous are naturally continued. A whaling vessel is dispatched on a very uncertain errand, and is not expected, like an ordinary passage ship, to arrive at a given port on a particular day, and to return to port on another day fixed. The whaler may be a long or short time about

her work, according to the luck and energy of her crew: and if she were navigated by a captain and seamen paid by wages, there would be constant suspicion on the part of the owner that due exertion had not been made. Mining is conducted underground, far removed from the superintendence of the capitalist; and here again suspicion of idleness and negligence on the part of labourers, would be apt to arise. By giving to the captain and seamen in the one case, to the foremen or butties in the other case, a personal interest in the results, these difficulties are avoided; and the capitalist is satisfied that a reasonable energy will be exerted to render the undertaking profitable.

In manufactories where men are paid by the day, it is no doubt very advantageous to have constantly among the labourers a certain number of persons, who are interested in the success of the concern. But where workmen are paid by the piece, or where the processes are so well defined that people employed by the day must do their duty, it is easy to carry on a manufactory with salaried clerks and foremen. Where a duty is strictly one of routine, I suspect that it is better performed by one who is simply paid to perform it, than by one whose mind is constantly disturbed by hope of gain and fear of loss. Principals are often very careless accountants. I have more than once tried, and with very ill success, the plan of giving a personal interest to foremen or managers.

But if a distribution of a share of profit to managers, is of doubtful pecuniary advantage, it can hardly be

supposed that an extension of such a practice to workmen generally, would be found to pay. And if it did not pay, it would not be commonly adopted. People carry on a business, and ought to carry it on, with a view to earn an income. They are bound to avoid whatever trenches on the rights of others; they are bound to act with perfect honesty; they are bound to make a good use of their influence over their dependents; but they are not called upon to give up to their workmen a part of their profits. Philanthropists frequently discuss these matters, as if they thought that the main concern of a manufacturer should be to benefit his workpeople; and that to live by his business should be a secondary consideration. But why should a manufacturer be expected to be more benevolent than other persons? Medical men are eminently liberal with advice and medicine: yet their first business is to live. Even clergymen, whose very profession it is to reform the world, are not indifferent to tithes and surplice fees. Do attorneys and barristers think first of their clients and then of themselves? Why should more be expected from manufacturers than from merchants, lawyers, physicians, or clergymen? But it is asked, what difference would it make to rich manufacturers; whether they got their present incomes or only two-thirds, or half as much? The error here consists in the assumption that manufacturers generally are rich. But any one who will take the trouble to inquire, will find that manufacturers generally are not rich, any more than merchants or lawyers generally are rich.

Most manufacturers, like most men of other vocations, have to struggle with difficulties before they can secure a competency for themselves and their families. Such men cannot be expected to divide among their workmen, the profits which are necessary as a provision for their old age and for their families afterwards.

SECTION V.—Recapitulation—How the work was received in Paris—Many objections raised by the periodical press—Louis Blanc's answers—How could Government find markets?—Comparison of Paraguay under the Jesuits—If competition ruinous, how are the United States prosperous?—Louis Blanc's plan is not one of association, but one of competition, viz., between capitalists and labourers—How fix rate of interest?—Difficulties about elections—Many other objections—Individualism the real point of attack.

I have endeavoured in the four previous sections, to give a fair account of Louis Blanc's scheme as developed in his *Organization of Labour*. After explaining some of his general notions, I have shown how he argues against the present competitive system, as leading to insufficient wages, destitution, ignorance, and crime; as making tyrants of masters, as setting the middle classes against each other, and as enabling the great capitalists to crush the smaller ones. I have also attempted a sketch of his very flimsy proposal to give a community of interest to every labourer; so that each working-man among thirty-four millions of people, should share the profit derived from the labour of every other working-man. I have also shown that a portion of

these profits is to be set aside as a fund for the relief of distress.

I have objected to these statements that the allegations are not true: that wages, instead of falling, have decidedly risen: that the condition of the working classes, far from getting worse, has certainly improved: that the masters are not tyrants, because the men are quite able to protect themselves: that so far from the great capitalists being able to crush the smaller ones, it is the beginners, the men of small means, who are always the first to lower prices, and that it is these inferior men of business who constantly drive the larger concerns out of the market, by means of greater activity and energy. As to the proposed scheme of an universal distribution of universal profit, I have tried to show that such a multitude of complex accounts as would be necessary, could not be kept; and that the entire project is the merest chimera that was ever entertained in the brain of a student inexperienced in affairs: and that with regard to the portion of profit to be set aside as a fund for the distressed, that is a very bad imitation of our poor-laws, the same end being more attainable by a rate on property. On the more limited scheme developed by the *Maison Leclaire* need say no more here.

Other objections in abundance, present themselves; and particularly to the main article of the creed on which the whole system is founded. "Wherever the certainty of living by labour does not result from the very essence of social institutions, there iniquity is

predominant." In Louis Blanc's opinion, every man has a right to demand from society the opportunity of labouring. However numerous, however excessive, the population of a country, every individual has a right to demand work and maintenance from the community, if he fails of obtaining it from private persons. It may be said that this is nothing more than the principle of our poor-laws, which stand between every man and starvation. But our poor-laws are fenced round with many qualifications. First there is the law of settlement, which hinders a person from permanently claiming relief anywhere but in the place of birth, or some other parish where a new settlement has been obtained. Then again, the authorities do not say to a mechanic, if your trade fails we will be a master to you: they do not say, you are a ploughman, we will find you land, a plough, and seed: you are a blacksmith, we will furnish you with a stithy, bar-iron, coals, and horses to shoe; you are a power-loom weaver, you shall have a factory and yarn to work with. The offer is a far more moderate one. You are ill: we will find you attendance and medicine. You are out of work; come into the union and you, with your family, shall be fed and clothed; but we shall expect you to break stones or dig in a field: we cannot employ you at your own trade. Louis Blanc has stigmatized our poor-laws as a folly; but our folly, if it is such, is wisdom compared with his outrageous imbecility, in desiring to supersede individualism, and

chant, the sole shopkeeper; and for anything that appears to the contrary, the sole head of the physicians and lawyers of society.

Instead of urging other objections, I will state shortly how this work was received in Paris, and what difficulties presented themselves to the minds of French readers. I know nothing on these points but what Louis Blanc himself tells me, but I have no suspicion of ill-faith on his part. He mentions many newspapers and periodicals which criticized him: particularly the *Siècle*, the *Constitutionnel*, the *Charivari*, the *Phalange* (Fourierist), the *Globe*, the *Revue des deux Mondes*, the *Débats*; all of them names familiar to us, besides many of which we know less. He professes to detail and answer their objections.

"How," says one of these critics, "how would the Government get on when it had undertaken to conduct business? If we are to judge by the example which the minister of public works furnishes, we may anticipate that it would not be remarkable for economy, activity, enterprise, or progress. We can understand a Government directing labours for the public service, where the State is at once producer and consumer, or where the produce is collected as a tax. But when the State shall have become the sole manufacturer, and shall undertake to provide for the demands of private consumption, by what means will it dispose of its products, and find markets at home or abroad?"

Louis Blanc confesses the gravity of the difficulty, if the case were what is here stated. But he says

that his system has been confounded with that of the St. Simonians, and that for his part he desires the Government to become only the regulator of industry, and not the undertaker of business. The State is to found social workshops, to furnish means of labour, to construct industrial statutes having the form of law : but the State is by no means to become speculator or manufacturer. The Government is to have no part of the profits of the business carried on. The answer seems to me inconclusive. A man is out of work and applies to the Government for assistance. He is sent to the social workshop and is there furnished with tools and materials for his trade. When he has made a machine or a piece of cloth, it cannot be intended that he should carry it off; but he must be paid by the manager of the workshop, according to the time he has laboured, or the quantity of work he has done. The managers of the establishment will have to find a market for the machine or the cloth. If Louis Blanc means to say merely, that it is not the Government, but some body corporate, which has to find the market, that leaves the objection as valid as before. This other body corporate, elected by the workmen if you please, is not likely to be a better administrator than the minister of public works.

Another author illustrates the probable effects of the scheme, by a reference to Paraguay and the Jesuit administration there. He says that that country realized perfectly, the Utopia of a community of goods and of social fraternity. He quotes Raynal as saying,

“It would seem that a population ought to have multiplied exceedingly, under an administration in which no one is idle, no one is overworked; where the food is wholesome, abundant, the same for all citizens, who are also well clothed; where old men, widows, and orphans, are well provided for; where every one marries from choice and with disinterested motives, and where a multitude of children are a consolation and not a charge; where no debauch, which is inseparable from idleness, shortens the term of health or of life; where there is nothing to unduly excite the passions or to oppose the natural appetites; where there is commerce but no luxury; . . . such a country we should suppose would be highly populous. But it is not so.” It is added that on a territory as large as France, Paraguay, after three centuries of existence, contains only half a million of inhabitants. I quote this passage rather as an example of the tone adopted in opposing Louis Blanc, than as containing an objection of any weight. To compare France with Paraguay is about as apposite as to compare France with a colony in the moon.

Here is another passage of more sense. “If competition were an inevitable cause of destitution and ruin, how can we explain the prosperity of the United States, the country of competition?” To this Louis Blanc rejoins that nothing is easier. The Americans are not shut up, as the French are, in a limited space. The extent of their territory has saved them, at least in part, from the curses of competition. But it has not saved them altogether. They too have their extreme

development of credit, their excess of private speculations, their extravagance of desires springing naturally from unbounded competition. They have also their cupidity, selfishness, ill-faith, coarseness of ideas and manners. Louis Blanc, as we see, is not complimentary to the Americans, nor have I found other writers of his stamp any more flattering towards them. It is true no doubt, that France like other old nations, has disadvantages to bear in consequence of the straitness of her territory. But under the same pressure, the English have learned to resort to measures which the French at present shrink from. We say, our territory is bounded: we cannot enlarge it: let us therefore diminish our numbers by emigration. A remedy safer by far than to make ourselves slaves to huge bodies corporate, who after all could not stretch our boundaries, or increase our fertile land, or buy food from abroad.

Another critic says: "The capital objection to M. Louis Blanc's scheme, is this: that professing to extinguish competition by association, it is really a plan of competition and not at all of association. It contains within it this germ of impurity, which ought not to have escaped the shrewdness of its author. In truth, M. Louis Blanc admits capitalists into his association, on condition that they shall receive interest on the principal they invest, and shall not share the profits except so far as they work. Thus, capitalists will have a right to an annuity of fixed amount, and one not varying according to the profit or loss of the national workshop. Far from being associated with the labourers,

their desire will be to get the highest possible interest on their principal, whereas the labourers aim at the reverse. Here then, remains between the two agents of production, capitalist and labourer, a palpable opposition ; and consequently, lying, fraud, hatred ; that is, competition and all its fruits. But in the eyes of an economist, capital does not consist merely of money ; a limitation that would compress the conflicting interests within a narrow circle ; but capital includes all the instruments of labour, every source of commodities, the whole field of production. Thus the owners of lands, factories, cattle, realty and stock, are utterly cut off from the labourers. Competition, which in this scheme ought to have its death-blow, receives instead a solemn authorization."

Without stopping to point out some minor points on which I might differ from the writer of this well-argued passage, I must say that it is difficult to conceive what satisfactory reply can be offered to it. I have already observed that in one respect there is, and must be, an antagonism between capitalists and labourers ; while in another respect there is between these two classes a community of interest. Extinguish capital and the labourer must perish ; diminish capital and the labourer suffers : so far there is an agreement of interest, and both capitalists and labourers must rejoice to see capital increased. But with regard to the revenue derived from capital there is an opposition of interest. When the rate of interest is high, the capitalist is benefited but the labourer is injured. The labourers therefore,

have reason for desiring a superabundance of capital and a proportionably low rate of interest: the individual capitalist has reason to wish that capital generally should be scarce, but his own capital abundant. The well being of labourers and of persons of property, is therefore promoted by opposite conditions; and there really is an antagonism between them.

But let us see what is Louis Blanc's reply to this difficulty. He says that in the first instance, the State furnishes the capital for the social workshops: that capitalists are then invited to join the association and to invest their principal on interest. They may accept this offer or refuse it, they may join or stand aloof. But then comes the question what rate of interest is to be paid, and how the rate is to be fixed? Is it to be always the same, or is it to vary according to circumstances? Oh! says Louis Blanc, the rate may be fixed by the legislature from time to time. Fixed by the legislature? Will not discussion take place before any determination is come to? And will not the debates bring to light the opposition of desire between the two classes? Suppose that such workshops had been established soon after Louis Blanc's work was published: that government had supplied the funds at first, but that private persons had soon invested their money in the association, at the rate of four per cent. per annum. We know that a few years after that date, floating capital became scarce throughout Europe; partly from the large amounts that became fixed in railroads, partly from the great extension of business

consequent on our adoption of free-trade measures, partly also from the considerable demands caused by the Russian war. As soon as the rate of interest had risen throughout the world, the holders of four per cent. stock in the social workshops would have become dissatisfied; they would have asked for an increased rate, and if this were refused they would have withdrawn their capital. It would have been urged by the labourers, that an increased rate of interest would cause a diminished rate of profit and therefore a diminished remuneration for work. This no doubt, would be so; and yet it could not be expected that capitalists would continue to receive a less rate than they could obtain with equal security, elsewhere. Disguise it as we may, there is a natural antagonism with regard to the rate of interest, between capitalist and workman: and neither social workshops, nor other devices, will remove the opposition. If the time ever comes when workmen generally will also be capitalists, the difficulty will be solved. But after all the world is full of such difficulties. It is the interest of a parent to treat his children parsimoniously, while the children's interest leads them to get all they can. It is my interest to squeeze my weaker neighbour, to rob him even, under colour of law: it is my weaker neighbour's interest to resist my spoliation. The government, whether monarchical or republican, has an interest in usurping the power of indefinite taxation; the subject has an equally strong interest in resisting. Life is a struggle, and wise men will resign themselves to inevitable destiny.

One critic remarks the consequences that would follow from the practice of electing all the officers of the social workshops. He points to municipal and parliamentary elections: what intrigues, lies, calumnies, false promises! What family quarrels, what demoralization of the whole country! Another critic asks why, if the Government performs this function of election the first year, and performs it well, it should not continue the practice in future years. Our republican author shrinks from this consummation. What! give to the central government the appointment of thousands, or scores of thousands, of salaried officials? This is the very shoal on which, as he contends, St. Simonianism made shipwreck. He would have authority in the government, and such as should be sufficient to draw the poor out of the mire in which they have sunk: but he shudders at the notion of authority so overwhelming as to crush out every spark of liberty.

There are other points raised, but they are of comparatively trifling importance. The State which furnishes funds, ought to share the profits, or else there is an injustice to the tax-payers outside the social workshops. The organization should begin with agriculture as well as manufactures. The whole conception is essentially St. Simonian. Capitalists should share in the profits, besides receiving interest, just as is proposed by Fourier: else it cannot be anticipated that the capitalist should interest himself in the well-being of the labourer. To this last proposition Louis Blanc replies, that a man who has inherited a property, and who has

done nothing beyond, like *Beaumarchais*' noble, *having given himself the trouble to be born*, may be well contented to receive interest, and leave profits to the labourers.

Another writer objects philosophically, that Louis Blanc's explanation of social evils is superficial: that he himself says, "from individualism, I have already remarked springs competition." But if so, then it was necessary to show how competition thus springs, and to inquire whether individualism itself, as the cause of the evil, was not the true point of attack. If for individualism we substitute egotism, I believe that the suggestion is a just one. The fault is not in our social organization, but in our unsocial selfishness. I do not mean that we ought to give more, or to work more, for others, than we do at present. I mean that we are too much bent on riches and pleasure, and thus elbow those who have their way to make. If a man having attained a competency; (and to attain that no honest sacrifice can be too great,) would relax his exertions, and adopt a quiet unostentatious mode of life, there then would be room for those who have not yet been so fortunate. There would then be no need to squeeze those below us or to struggle with our equals. It is ambition, and that of a bad kind, which causes the principal evils of competition.

Many other objections has Louis Blanc recorded and answered. To most of us however, it is sufficient to know that the proposed scheme is impossible if it were desirable, and is most undesirable even if it were possible: that it would leave antagonism between capitalists

and labourers, just where it is : that it would destroy energy and enterprise, and lead to infinite heart-burnings and unnumbered frauds.

SECTION VI.—Louis Blanc on copyright—Would abolish—Why?—Because it destroys authority and corrupts authors—But does pay lunder other professional men from doing their duty?—Love of fame may also corrupt—Examples of English authors—Macaulay, Dickens, Scott, Byron, Gibbon, Hume, Goldsmith, Johnson—First principle of justice—M. Montel.

We seldom feel satisfied that we are thoroughly acquainted with any proposed system, until we know something of the author who has invented it: and we should have a very imperfect notion of Louis Blanc's singular character, if we were ignorant of the notions he entertains about the copyright of books. A few years ago this was a fertile subject of discussion in England: some persons maintaining that an author should have the exclusive right of printing his book, only for a term of years after the first publication; just as is the case in patents for mechanical inventions: some persons holding that the right should continue for life, but should cease at death; some that it should continue twenty or thirty years after death: while others were found bold enough to assert that, like property generally, it should continue for ever. We might have thought that these various propositions exhausted the subject. By no means: Louis Blanc thinks them all wrong, and violently wrong: his notion is that an author ought to have no exclusive right whatever. That a man who is himself

an author, an eloquent author, a successful author, a voluminous author, should hold, or at least publish, such an opinion, is extraordinary. So startling is this, that I have asked myself, again and again, can it really be true? I will give a sketch of Louis Blanc's argument, that it may be seen how he arrives at his conclusion. He commences thus:

"Authors abound; some grow rich, others die of hunger; bookselling is ruined; printing is undone; public taste is perverted; notwithstanding a superabundant wealth of books, never was the domain of intellect more sterile. Such is the evil, and it is a crying one. What is the proposed remedy? An extension from twenty to thirty years after death, of the author's exclusive right. How much was Lord Chesterfield in the right, when he said to his son, about to visit the principal courts of Europe; 'Go my son, and see with how little reason the world is governed.'

"I will explain immediately how absurd it is to create a literary property, and how fatal to society is the prolonged exercise of this so called right, which it is proposed to confirm; but before examining the numerous questions that arise, I ask what is the aim of the legislator.

"His aim is evidently, to give security to the profession of literature, regarded as a means of earning a livelihood. But is it in the nature of things, is it for the public welfare, that literature should be reduced to an industrial occupation? Is it well that society should contain numerous men who make books in order to grow rich, or even to live? I affirm the contrary.

“And the reason is simple. In order that an author may worthily fulfil his mission, he must rise above the prejudices of mankind, he must have the courage to offend them to be useful; in short he must exercise a moral authority over them. This mission belongs as much to the song-writer as to the moralist, to the poet as to the philosopher, to him who makes us laugh as to him who draws our tears. Little matters it what form is assumed by this moral sovereignty of the author. It is just as real in Beaumarchais as in Nicole, and in Molière as in Pascal.

“Yes, literature has over society a right of command. But what becomes of this right, if the man of letters descends to the exercise of a trade, if he makes books only to *accumulate a fortune*? To be a slave to the tastes of the public, to flatter its prejudices, to cram its ignorance, to compound with its errors, to tickle its evil passions, to write for it, in a word, all that is destructive but agreeable: such are the conditions necessary for him who makes a market of his genius. What! In exchange for my gold, you shame my stupidity, you insult my egotism, you disturb the enjoyment of my ill-gotten wealth, you alarm me for a future? Your wisdom is too costly, I will none of it. Thus does thought lose its character of instructor and its moral authority. The writer, if he hangs on public favour, loses the faculty of guiding; he loses even the desire of it; he is an abdicated monarch.”

Such is the foundation of Louis Blanc's opinion, that copyright should be abolished; that an author having once given a book to the world, should have no power

of restraining other persons from reprinting it as they please. It is a common practice in the United States, to fill up a portion of the newspapers with the last new novel from England. Would Louis Blanc seriously think it right that the day after one of his eloquent volumes has appeared, it should be reproduced in the *feuilleton* of the *Siècle* or the *Presse*?

But the reasoning of the passage I have quoted, is far from being conclusive. An author has a moral authority over society: all his readers are influenced by what he writes: they may be stimulated to aristocratic or democratic sentiments; they may have their moral tone raised or lowered by his book. What is the conclusion we should naturally draw from this serious reflection? That every author should remember his responsibility, that he should scrupulously adhere to truth, that he should advance no opinion without having carefully considered it, that he should put on paper no sentiment tending to corruption. But Louis Blanc's conclusion is essentially different: it is, that an author should not write for money.

It is assumed here that what a man does for money, he cannot do honestly, and still less, magnanimously. The receiving money is so corrupting, that he who touches it is thenceforth a slave to evil passions. But men in other professions receive money for their services. The physician takes his fee; and yet he is obliged by his duty to warn his rich patients against sloth, his poorer patients against sensuality. The lawyer charges for his advice; and he is bound to

temper the rage of an angry client, to hold him back from litigation, to refuse to lend himself to oppression under cover of law. The clergyman lives by his profession, is frequently dependent on the goodwill of his flock; and yet he wields a moral authority far exceeding that of most authors. If the literary man ought not to live by his writings, lest the desire of selling them should corrupt him, neither should the physician, the lawyer, or the clergyman live by his avocations, lest the desire of remuneration should tempt him to swerve from the straight path.

Authors may fairly complain of Louis Blanc, when he says that if they make a business of their writing, they will find themselves enslaved to the public; that they will flatter its prejudices, and humour it as a parasite humours a coarse-minded and vicious patron. It cannot be denied that there are many who pander to a morbid taste, many more who are deterred from speaking the truth. Great are the evils that attend upon the dependence of literature on the public. But it is hard to see how the mischief would be cured by depriving authors of their copyright. When that change had been made, the greater part of the present race of authors must die or be absorbed into other occupations. Who would then write? Men who had ambition to be famous or notorious. But the desire of publicity may lead men astray, just as the love of money, or the necessity of living, leads men astray. A man who desires to be read, will, if he is unprincipled, make himself a slave to the public, flatter its prejudices, and

foment its evil passions, whether the desire springs from a want of money or a want of notoriety.

If we refer to recent English authors, we shall not find that those who have attained the highest popularity and the largest income, have done this by pandering to the vicious tastes of the public. Macaulay stands proudly preeminent above his brethren, and no one will accuse him of ministering to any depraved desires. All that his worst enemies can say, is that in his anxiety to make history romantic, he has overloaded his style with epithets, and has daubed his characters with too coarse a brush. No one imagines that, moved by a greed of gain, he has written anything he does not entirely believe.

Next in popularity to Macaulay stands Dickens: and even the writer of certain articles in the *Saturday Review*, and of a late article in the *Edinburgh*, will not accuse him of stooping to gratify a prurient taste. Dickens's attempt at fine writing may, as is alleged, be sometimes laboured, sometimes melodramatic; but his sentiments are always pure. His characters may be too angelical or too diabolical, his repentances and conversions may be unnaturally complete, his deathbed scenes may be out of all drawing; but whatever his faults of execution, this must be said of him: that no one ever put a book of his down without feeling himself the better for having read it; without being conscious of an increased sympathy with the weak, the erring, and the unfortunate. Dickens certainly has not been led astray by a hankering after princely remuneration.

In the last generation, the most successful author by far, was Sir Walter Scott; the most popular poet was Lord Byron. In the case of neither of these do I see that the public would have benefited by the abolition of copyright. Scott wrote for money no doubt: no author more decidedly wrote for money. The one weak point in his admirable character was a desire for worldly greatness, and especially for greatness as a landowner; and to this folly he sacrificed many years of peace of mind and calm happiness. But the public benefited by the hallucination, since it was to find the purchase-money of farms improvidently bought, that he taxed his energies and exerted his wonderful inventive powers. The delightful romance of "Ivanhoe" was dictated between paroxysms, and sometimes under the very pressure, of racking pain. Engagements had to be met, credit had to be maintained, land to round off the estate had to be purchased: and the robust and stoical man drew upon his poetical imagination to supply his needs. Great was the gain of the world. And where was the drawback? Did Scott under the severest pressure, under the fear of mercantile dishonour, under the acute apprehension of personal humiliation if not disgrace;—did Scott ever publish either avowedly or anonymously, one line which on his deathbed he would have wished unwritten? Did he pander to vice? Did he foster prejudices with a view to profit? Whatever touch of worldliness may have tainted his high and generous spirit, never did he condescend to sully his paper with an opinion or

sentiment but such as he could unblushingly avow to the world. In his case, the abolition of copyright would have robbed the world of masterpieces of imagination, without conferring a shade of advantage as a compensation.

Of Byron, no doubt, moralists will say that the world could well have spared him. Perhaps they may be right. Though we puny mortals may well hesitate to speak slightingly of the greatness of his genius, yet we may not deny that even the best of his poems have little to elevate the mind, or to nerve it for the inevitable conflicts and the severe duties of life: and if we compare the effect that he produced on our youthful minds, with that produced by Scott, or Coleridge, or above all by the manly and thoughtful philosophy of Wordsworth, we must confess that we owe little to Byron, beyond a temporary though intense delight. Let us assume then, that it would have been better for the world if Don Juan and Beppo, or even if the Giaour and the Siege of Corinth and the Childe, had not been written. But this is no concession to Louis Blanc or his argument, unless he can make it probable that the existence of copyright was necessary to Byron's compositions. The reverse is the truth. Byron, though he was far from rich, did not publish for money: he had a fastidiousness on that point which led him in his *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*, to satirize Scott as a writer for hire; and which caused him to refuse remuneration from Murray for his earlier poems. If then, there had been no law of copyright, we should

have lost a great many of Scott's charming romances, and we should not have shut the door against Byron's blameable productions.

Few names in our literature are more obnoxious to many excellent persons, than those of Gibbon and Hume: neither the profound learning and melodious style of the one, nor the penetrating thought and manly independence of the other, can atone for their departure from the established standard of religion. Was it the desire of enriching themselves, was it a subservience to popular prejudice, which led their genius astray? I reply that if they had courted popular applause, Gibbon would have burnt his offensive chapter, Hume would have kept his scepticism locked up in his breast. Both wrote for fame rather than for lucre: Gibbon would not have surrendered his darling employment because there was no money to be made of it; and as to Hume, his early day-dream was of literary eminence, and it was for this, and for no sordid object, that he expatriated himself for years, and led the life of a recluse with the income of a mechanic. Copyright or no copyright, these men would have written their books.

No doubt there are instances on the other side. Some authors have put out vile publications, merely with a view to live by them. The necessities of an author vitiated Dryden's pen; and whenever the reading public is corrupt the venal author will be corrupt also. The gross and prurient tone of French novelists of the present day, is the inevitable result of a coarse

and vicious taste among French readers. The supposed abolition of copyright would seem to be a severe blow at these panders to indecency. But it is worthy of notice that the most abominable publications have no copyright, because the law acknowledges no property in obscenity and profanity. Any one might reprint Shelley's "Queen Mab," because the authorities of the law pronounced it blasphemous. Yet Holywell Street flourishes; and though its nauseous books have no copyright, they still continue to swarm.

If then, we were to divest authors of the property in their works which they now enjoy, that would not put an end to objectionable publications. But it would certainly deprive us of a considerable portion of our most valuable literature. I have already noticed how large a number of Scott's romances would never have been written under such circumstances. I might mention Johnson and Goldsmith as men who living by literature, must have sought other professions if the law had not protected their right. If we could have spared the *Rambler*, *Rasselas*, and the *Lives of the Poets*, we should not without a sigh renounce the *Vicar of Wakefield* and the *Deserted Village*.

But the case in favour of copyright rests on a more solid foundation than expediency; it is grounded on the first principles of justice. Here are two men starting in life, with equal abilities and equal chances of success in a busy career. The one becomes a physician or a lawyer: the other devotes himself to study and composition. The physician at middle life has attained to

eminence, possesses a large income, rolls about in his carriage, and enjoys great reputation and influence. His brother, after years of study, having eked out his small patrimony with periodical writing, has with some difficulty got his opinions put before the world in a book with his name on the title-page. For a time, for many years, small success follows. Though many of the thoughts are original, and even destined hereafter to be famous, yet the book is unpalatable or unknown to the public: perhaps because the subject is a dry one, perhaps because the style is heavy, possibly because the periodical writers, those midwives of literature, know as little of the topic in question as they do of the undulatory theory of light, or of differential equations. Here, you will say, the property is safe: no one will republish such a book. I grant it. But the time may come when the state of things is quite changed: when a happy accident, or a change of fashion, or the influence of a friendly critic, has brought the author into notice. The long neglected man begins to feel a few rays of sunshine to relieve his despondency: he is encouraged to reprint his obscure work and to publish other lucubrations. If the law did not protect him, would his property now be safe? What is to prevent an unscrupulous printer from stepping between the author and his gains, by republishing the now popular work, and reproducing his new books in the *feuilleton* of a newspaper? And why should the physician or lawyer enjoy the fruits of study, and perhaps of servility, while his brother who has worked harder, and who has done

something for mankind, is left in penury and disappointment?

Even with the protection at present granted, there is no doubt much hardship. Many writers earn a competent livelihood by happily hitting a mark at the right moment; by studying the public humour, and compiling or reproducing intellectual food when the appetite of the reading public is ready for it. An eastern war brings out swarms of books about Russia, though the year before, the very name of Tooke or Golovin would not have been listened to. The sepoy mutiny, (name of horror!) gives a thrilling interest in the history of India to those who a few months earlier gaped at the name of Orme or Mill: and the literary waiters upon Providence vary their productions accordingly. It is such men as these that Louis Blanc would put down, because they make a business of authorship. I cannot agree with him: it is not in the success of these authors that I see any hardship; on the contrary, I cheerfully yield them their gains: I see no reason why periodical writers (and such they are substantially) should not be paid for their efforts as other professional men are paid. The hardship is elsewhere: it is in the case of men who labour enthusiastically, on topics which are rewarded neither by popular favour nor by academic distinction.

Louis Blanc mentions one man as an example of those who bravely struggle with difficulties, and hold themselves independent of popular favour. "Among contemporary authors there is one, who by patient and

prolonged study, has recovered many of the broken links of the chain of tradition. Certainly no one has laboured at an historical work with more good-will and perseverance than M. Monteil; no one has devoted to a literary task a greater portion of his life. What would have become of him, if during the thirty or forty years he has applied to his work, he had looked to his publications for a livelihood? What would have become of him? I hesitate to say, but you divine it. But, thank Heaven! M. Monteil had an intrepidity and greatness of mind. To protect himself against the extremity of want, he had recourse to an honest industry: he sold the very materials of his studies; he sold the precious manuscripts collected here and there in his voyage of discovery. It was Rousseau copying music. Thanks to this determined conduct, M. Monteil lived, not without privations, but protected from the caprices of the public. He has remained master of himself, master of his work."

Now this seems to me a case of great hardship. It is deeply to be lamented that while ephemeral writers are earning handsome incomes, profound and persevering inquirers should be condemned to poverty. But Louis Blanc should have gone a step further, and should have inquired what would have been the result if M. Monteil had at last become famous. Directly this happened, if there were no copyright, any one who pleased might print M. Monteil's works. How would that gentleman have felt, if as he walked through Paris, he saw his own books offered for sale on every stall, and in the

hands of every one he met, while he himself was left to earn his living as he might, or to die in misery. Are men so bent on martyrdom that an example like this would find many imitators? Is this the way in which Louis Blanc would encourage grave and persevering study?

There is one other point of view worth consideration, though it cannot be compared in importance to what I have said before. If any one who chooses has a right to republish my book, I cease to have any power of securing accuracy of printing; I may be brought before the public in such a dress as will make me ridiculous; I may be made, by errors and omissions, to talk nonsense and to say things abhorrent to my taste and judgment. To a careful and fastidious writer, the notion of a cheap, vulgar, uncorrected, edition of his books, is quite excruciating. Louis Blanc would groan and fume if he saw his *History of France* mangled by a bungling printer.

I cannot doubt then, that the abolition of copyright would be a great misfortune to literature. But it is not to be supposed that Louis Blanc's opinion to the contrary is altogether unfounded; and we naturally ask what is really the ground on which it rests. I think it is expressed in some further remarks which he makes on M. Monteil, the profound investigator of history whom I have mentioned above. M. Monteil supported himself by a traffic in curious manuscripts, and thus secured the means of continuing his valuable examinations. "Suppose that instead of writing history with a

view to the triumph of truth, he had written it only to *gain money*; suppose that instead of living by the sale of unknown manuscripts, he had speculated on his own books: impatience of success would have mastered him, he would have written much faster and much worse. Instead of useful and prolific history—of agriculture, commerce, and trade, he would have adopted the diverting history of battles and court intrigues. Society would have lost a great historian and a fine work."

There seems to be here an excellent reason for endeavouring to bring up the rewards of profound study, more nearly to the standard of rewards obtained by popular authorship. Louis Blanc would equalise the remuneration in a different way; not by raising those of the student but by taking away those of the popular writer. Nay, worse. At the same time that he robs the public favourite of his present gains, he also robs the profound student of the chance of remuneration. He equalizes the condition of both by reducing both to destitution. And with what aim? In order to remove from the student the temptation to desert his career and to become a popular writer. He leaves for the obscene pander to prurient desires the income he at present makes; for such an outcast has already no copyright: he leaves the writer of the daily and weekly journals to his present salary; for copyright to him is of no value: but he takes away the earnings of the novelist, of the historian, of the man of science, and of the social economist, and leaves all such to get their living as they

may, by copying music like Rousseau, or by trafficking in manuscripts like Monteil.

If the law had hitherto left literature to its fate, if it had refused to recognise any property in a man's writings, we may be quite sure that the innovating zeal of Louis Blanc would have stood on the opposite tack: that he would have denounced the cruelty of society, which protected the physician, the lawyer, and the divine, but left the man of letters a prey to every piratical printer who chose to live by coining the thoughts of others into gold. According to Louis Blanc, whatever is, is wrong.

CHAPTER V.

PROUDHON.

SECTION I.—Proudhon's importance—A native and exhibitor of Besançon—His letter of 1840 to the Besançon Academy—Profession of doctrines of equality and of misanthropy—The Academy disavows him—M. Blanqui's letter—Proudhon's conclusion.

THE French revolution of 1848, threw the Government of a great country, into the hands of men who had hitherto railed at everything actually existing, and who had recommended the adoption of strange and untried measures, without any notion that they should ever find themselves at the helm of affairs, and should be called upon to put their fanciful theories into practice. Conspicuous among these men, were Louis Blanc and Proudhon. This circumstance gives to any inquiry into their life and writings, an interest such as we should not otherwise have felt. Many other men have held opinions as strange as theirs, and have given utterances to their dogmas in language as bold and even as eloquent, without attracting to themselves the attention of the civilized world. But thanks to the eccentric perturbations of a volatile people, Louis Blanc and Proudhon are more than authors, and if far removed from being statesmen, they are at any rate historical characters.

This is the reason why I have assigned to Louis Blanc a considerable space in the present volume, and why I propose to explain what are the opinions propounded by Proudhon.

Every one has heard of the inquiry, *What is Property?* Yet few persons, I believe, are aware of the circumstances under which the book bearing that title, was published. Proudhon was brought up at Besançon, which has also the doubtful honour of being the native place of Fourier. Did the reputation of Fourier stimulate young Proudhon to emulate the whimsical flights of his townsman?

Besançon is a place of considerable importance in Franche Comté, and before the first revolution, possessed a university, which afterwards subsided into an academy. To this institution, Proudhon in 1840 addressed a letter, the contents of which will put the man to a considerable degree before us.

“TO THE MEMBERS OF THE ACADEMY OF BESANÇON.

“GENTLEMEN,—

“Paris, 30th June, 1840.

“In your deliberation of 9th May, 1833, regarding the triennial exhibition founded by Madame Suard, you expressed the following desire:—

“*The Academy invites the exhibitor to submit to it, some time in the first half of July in each year, a short and methodical explanation of the studies he has pursued during the previous year.* This I am about to do.

“When I solicited your votes, I stated openly my intention to study *the means of ameliorating the physical,*

moral, and intellectual condition of the class the most numerous and most indigent. This notion, foreign as it might appear to the object of my candidature, was favourably received by you; and by the invaluable distinction which you conferred on me, you converted this engagement into an inviolable and sacred obligation. I then learnt with how excellent and honourable an institution I was connected: my esteem for its enlightenment, my gratitude for its patronage, my zeal for its glory, were unbounded.

“Convinced, in the first place, that in order to escape from the beaten path of opinions and systems, it was necessary to introduce into the study of man and of society, scientific habits and severe method, I devoted one year to philology and grammar; *la linguistique*, or the natural history of speech, being of all sciences the one which accorded best with the character of my mind, and appearing to me to have the most direct relation to the researches I proposed. An essay written at this time on one of the most interesting questions of comparative grammar, if it did not exhibit any remarkable success, at least proved the solidity of my studies.

“Since that time, metaphysics and ethics have altogether engaged my attention; the conviction which I have attained, that these sciences, though at present ill-defined, and with boundaries unfixed, are yet like the natural sciences, susceptible of demonstration and certainty, has already rewarded my labours.

“But, gentlemen, of all my masters, it is to you I owe the most. Your competitions, your programmes,

your directions, according with my secret and most cherished aspirations, have never failed to enlighten me and to point out my road: this essay on property is the offspring of your thoughts.

“In 1838, the Academy of Besançon proposed the following question: *To what cause are we to attribute the constant increase of suicides; and what are the best means of arresting the effects of this moral contagion?*

“This was to ask, though in less general terms, what is the cause of social evil, and what is its remedy. You, gentlemen, acknowledged this, when your commission declared that the candidates had completely enumerated the immediate and particular causes of suicide, as well as the means of preventing each of them; but that from this enumeration made with more or less talent, no positive information was afforded, either as to the first cause of the evil, or as to a remedy.

“In 1839, your programme, always pointed and varied in its academic expression, became more precise. The candidates of 1838 had pointed out as causes, or properly speaking as symptoms, of the social disorder, neglect of religious and moral principles, greed of wealth, mania for pleasure, political excitement; all these elements were combined by you into a single proposition: *As to the utility of the observance of Sunday in relation to health, morals, family and urban interests.*

“Under Christian expressions, gentlemen, you asked what is the true system of society. One candidate” (Proudhon himself) “ventured to maintain, and thought himself to have proved, that the establishment of a

weekly rest is necessarily connected with a political system based on an equality of conditions; that without this equality, such an institution is an anomaly and an impossibility; that equality alone can restore this antique and mysterious consecration of the seventh day. This essay did not meet with your approbation, because, without denying the connection of ideas pointed out by the writer, you judged, and with reason, that the principle of equality of conditions not being itself demonstrated, the ideas of the author did not escape from the region of conjecture.

“Finally, gentlemen, you have opened this fundamental principle of equality, to competition, in the following terms: *As to the economic and moral results that have hitherto followed, and are likely to follow hereafter, from the French law of equal division of property among children.*

“Unless we were to content ourselves with commonplaces without any greatness or range, the following, I think, must be the way of understanding your question:

“If the law has secured equality of inheritance to all the children of one father, may it not secure the same equality to all the grandchildren and great grandchildren?

“If the law no longer recognizes younger children in a family, may it not enact by the law of inheritance, that there shall be none such in the race, the tribe, the nation?

“Can equality, by the right of succession, be secured

among citizens, as well as among cousins and brothers? In a word, can the principle of succession become a principle of equality?

"To sum up all these propositions in one general expression: What is the principle of inheritance? What are the foundations of inequality? What is property?

"Such, gentlemen, is the aim of the essay I now offer you."

"I have spoken with little respect of jurisprudence; I had a right to do so; but I should be unjust if I failed to distinguish this pretended science from the men who pursue it. Devoted to painful and severe studies, worthy in every way of the esteem of their fellow-citizens by their knowledge and eloquence, our lawyers are open to only one reproach, that of an excess of deference to arbitrary rules.

"I have pursued the economists with un pitying criticisms; as to these men, I confess that generally I like them not. The assumption and emptiness of their writings, their impertinent pride and inexpressible blunders, are revolting. Let those read them, who knowing them, can pardon them.

"I have applied to the Christian Church as a teacher, severe blame, and justly. This blame is founded on facts that I exhibit: what right has the Church to utter decrees on matters of which it is ignorant? The Church has gone astray in dogma and in morals; evidence both physical and mathematical is against her. I may be wrong in saying this; but undoubtedly it is the mis-

fortune of Christendom that my assertion is true. To restore religion the Church must be condemned."

This long quotation brings the character of Proudhon forward, far better than anything I could have said. We see the scholar, and the pensioner of the Provincial Academy, adopting the general principle of St. Simon and Fourier, and labouring to prove its truth, after a fashion of his own. Proudhon's argumentation is bold and striking: that of a man who values himself on his dialectical power; who can say a hundred clever things such as will silence an opponent, but will scarcely convince any one. The worthy professors and councillors of Besançon, must have been greatly scandalized at having warmed such a viper in their bosom; and must have trembled with indignation on reading the ironical compliments I have given. But I must yet quote more of this letter, and the next part I select is extraordinary, and looks like an imitation of Rousseau.

"Why should I not confess it, gentlemen? I have sought your suffrages and have desired the title of your exhibitor, in hatred of all that exists and with projects of destruction; I will complete this course of study in a spirit of calm and resigned philosophy. The understanding of truth has restored to me more coolness than the sentiment of oppression had inspired me with anger."

Afterwards he affects a very unpopular tone. "The people, incapable still of soundly judging as to its own interests, applauds equally the most opposite ideas, provided their author flatters it: the people judge of the

laws of thought as of the boundaries of the possible ; it is no more competent to-day to distinguish a man of science from a sophist, than formerly a philosopher from a wizard. ‘ *Ready*,’ says Charron, ‘ *to believe, collect, and scrape together all novelties, holding all reports as true and certain, you may with a whisper or tone of novelty collect a crowd as you collect flies with a basin.*’ ”

We naturally inquire what course the Academy adopted, in the perplexing position of having its own scholar preaching sedition and revolution. Two months after it had received Proudhon’s letter, it came to the following resolutions. “ A member calls the attention of the Academy to a pamphlet published last June by an exhibitor of the Suard fund, with the title, *What is Property?* and dedicated by the author to the Academy. He is of opinion that the company owes it to justice, to example, and to its own dignity, to disavow publicly the antisocial doctrines contained in this publication. He therefore demands :

“ 1st ; that the Academy should disavow and condemn with all formality, the production of the Suard Exhibitioner, as having been published without its consent, and as attributing to it opinions directly in opposition to the principles of every one of its members ;

“ 2ndly ; that the exhibitor should be directed in case of a second edition, to cancel the dedication ;

“ 3rdly ; that these resolutions of the Academy should be included in its printed reports.

“ These propositions having been put to the vote, were carried.”

Proudhon made himself merry with these proceedings. He says; "after this burlesque decree, which its authors thought to render vigorous, by the contradiction it contained, I have only to beg my reader to abstain from measuring the intelligence of my compatriots by that of our Academy." He adds that his essay was very differently treated by M. Blanqui, professor of political economy, and member of the Institute of Paris. M. Blanqui undertook Proudhon's defence before his brethren and before the minister, "and saved him from the strokes of a justice always blind because it is always ignorant." It appears that M. Vivien, the minister of justice, had thought of prosecuting Proudhon for this essay; but that he saw fit first to consult M. Blanqui on the subject; and that on his advice the notion of a legal proceeding was abandoned. In comparing this conduct of MM. Vivien and Blanqui, with that of the Besançon Academy, Proudhon asks how it is that "notwithstanding the virtues and talents which shine in Academies," they are generally "centres of intellectual repression, of folly, and of sordid intrigue." I cannot say that in my opinion, the perverse exhibitioner, who sought the suffrages and pecuniary assistance of the literary institution of his native town, in hatred of everything existing and with projects of destruction, had any reason to complain, because the directors of that institution disavowed an essay directly tending, in the opinion of all moderate men, to disturb the very foundations of society, in a country which has at all times peculiar reason to dread an access of

revolutionary fever. Men who write against property, must be resigned to the fate of having men of property look askance at them.

A letter written by M. Blanqui is worthy of some notice, as showing the impression created on the mind of an able professor of political economy, a man too, who by Proudhon's own statement, exhibited much moderation of judgment and suavity of temper. After thanking Proudhon for a copy of his essay, M. Blanqui expresses his gratification at finding that the second edition was in its form at least, more moderate than the original edition, and free from that coarseness which gave an air of a political pamphlet to what ought to be a work of grave philosophy. "People do not expend so much talent with a view to set their country in a blaze. This crude proposition of yours, *property is robbery*, was of a kind to disgust even those thoughtful minds who do not judge of things by their outside, if you had pertinaciously retained it in its original roughness. But if you have qualified the form, you have been faithful to the substance of your doctrines. . . .

"I agree with you only on one point: that there is too frequent an abuse of all kinds of property. But I do not jump from abuse to abolition, an heroic expedient too much resembling death, a cure for all ills. I will go further, I will concede that of all abuses, the most odious, as it seems to me, are those of property; but again, for this wrong there is a remedy, without violating the right of property, and above all without destroying

it. If our present laws are defective, we can reform them.

"This is what I said to the Institute the day I gave an account of your book. I knew that a prosecution was thought of; you will never know perhaps, how it happened that I was fortunate enough to prevent it." M. Blanqui goes on to say that he had felt great anxiety on this matter, and had lost two nights' sleep from his solicitude: that he had explained to the executive that the book was an academical dissertation and not the manifesto of an incendiary. "Your style is too high for the use of those blockheads who discuss with showers of stones in the highways, the greatest questions of social order. But take care, sir, that they do not soon come in spite of you to furnish themselves with arms in this formidable arsenal; and that your vigorous dialectic does not fall into the hands of some street-sophist, who may comment upon it before a hunger-pinched audience: pillage will then be the conclusion and peroration."

After again protesting that he is deeply moved by the abuses he witnesses, M. Blanqui proceeds thus. "No one knows better than you what danger there is, in pruning an old tree, of cutting off the promise of fruit. You are a grave and well-read man, a meditative mind; you speak of the demoniacs of the day in terms lively enough to satisfy the most timid; but still you conclude that property should be abolished! You desire to do away with the most powerful lever which acts on human intelligence; you attack the paternal sentiment in its most gentle illusions; you prevent, in a word, the for-

mation of capitals, and henceforth we are to build on sand, not on granite."

After quoting this able letter, of which I have given a large portion, and after making a few comments upon it, Proudhon makes some concession. He says; "I allow that in the present state of the question, the mind may well hesitate as to the abolition of property. If our cause is to triumph, it is not sufficient, in fact, to overthrow an acknowledged principle, and one which has the indisputable merit of according with our political creed: it is necessary also to establish the opposite principle, and to give a form to the system which flows from it. Further, it behoves us to show how this new system will satisfy all the moral and political needs which have caused the establishment of the former one. These then are the conditions of ultimate evidence on which I make my previous demonstrations depend.

"To find a system of absolute equality, in which all our present institutions, except property or the entire abuses of property, may not only find their place, but may be themselves the means of equality: individual liberty, division of powers, public ministry, jury, administrative and judicial organization, unity and wholeness in instruction, marriage, family, inheritance direct and collateral, right of sale and exchange, right of bequeathing and even right of primogeniture;—a system which, better than property, secures the accumulation of capital and excites the ardour of all; which from a higher point of view explains, corrects, and completes, the theories of association proposed up to the

present day, from Plato and Pythagoras to St. Simon and Fourier ;—a system in a word, which serving as a means of transition may be immediately applicable.”

In reading this last paragraph, it is puzzling to find Proudhon proposing to find a system, in which, after the abolition of property, there are still to exist inheritance, right of sale, right of bequeathing, and accumulation of capital. If there is to be no property, what is to be inherited? what is to be the subject of sale or exchange? What is the worth of the right of bequeathing when there is nothing to bequeath? how can there be an accumulation of capital, when capital, which is only one form of property, does not subsist? If it is meant that substitutes for all these institutions are to be found, Proudhon had better have said so; and he would have said so but that he was bent on playing with words, to the neglect of the things they expressed.

Proudhon has at least the grace to acknowledge the difficulty of the task he proposes. “A work so vast would require, as I am aware, the joint efforts of twenty Montesquieus: yet if it is not given to one man to complete the enterprise, he may at any rate begin it. The road which he traverses will exhibit the object and secure the result.”

SECTION II.—Social miseries and moral philosophy—Definition of property—but limits in practice—Definition of it in 1793, and of the Code Napoléon—Toullier on rights—The English avoid definitions—Why taxes should be levied in proportion to property—Proudhon condemns a poor-law—But all property now is held in fee and of the Crown, and therefore subject to the performance of duties—Property is robbery—Where?—Suppose Proudhon in Cayenne—Property is impossible—Arithmetic governs the world—Impossibility of property demonstrated—Proudhon a professed anarchist—Concluding rant.

The previous section may have conveyed some notion of the whimsical character of Proudhon; as a man of reading and thought, living in a dream-land of words; tainted with a morbid desire of notoriety, and an affectation of misanthropy copied from Jean Jacques; careless, apparently, of the real interests of humanity, if only, by abusing whatever is, he may glitter in the eyes of the public; convinced of his own competency to reconstruct society after removing the base on which all institutions are at present founded. I propose in this section to exhibit shortly the grounds on which Proudhon rests his opinions as to property and its abuses.

He commences his essay, as other innovators have done, by a declamation on the miseries of society. He asked himself one day, why there was so much wretchedness, and whether man was doomed to be always unhappy: and dissatisfied with the ordinary answers which assign the imbecility and iniquity of governments, the follies of innovators, the general corruption and ignorance, as the causes of the common misery, he read a hundred volumes of philosophy, law,

political economy, history, and came to the conclusion that the world is utterly ignorant of the meaning of the words, at once vulgar and sacred, *justice, equity, liberty*. But startled at this result, he again asked himself; is it really possible that in applying the principles of morals, men can have so long deceived themselves? How and why can this have happened? And as this error is universal, must it not be invincible? Proudhon then proceeds to give an outline of his mental philosophy, justifying this course by the proceeding of Pascal, who when he met with a geometrical problem, invented first a method of solution. He afterwards criticises Aristotle and the modern metaphysicians, and declares that Reid and Kant are farther from the truth than the old Stagyrite.

Passing over this display of scholastic learning, which is foreign to the purpose, I proceed to the question of property and its rights, as laid down in the second chapter. But here again we find the same *scholasticism*, the same love of subtle verbal distinctions, which is displayed in the first chapter. I will give some examples. "The Roman law defines property, *jus utendi et abutendi re suâ, quatenus juris ratio patitur; le droit d'user et d'abuser de la chose, autant que le comporte la raison du droit*. An attempt has been made to justify the word *abuse*, by saying that it expresses, not a senseless and immoral abuse, but only absolute dominion. A vain distinction, imagined for the consecration of property, and of no efficacy against the delirium of enjoyment, which it neither hinders nor

represses. The proprietor is at liberty to leave his fruits to rot ungathered, to sow salt in his field, to milk his cows into the sand, to change a vineyard into a desert, and to turn a cabbage-garden into a park; as to all these things, are they, or are they not, abuses? In the matter of property, use and abuse are necessarily confounded."

Now let us see, putting the barren definition aside, whether there are not some limits, at least in England, to a man's abuse of his property. Suppose a gentleman chooses, from whim or carelessness, to leave the fruits in his orchard ungathered; it certainly is not the duty of the police to interfere: nor is it a case for police interference even if he should leave his sheep unshorn and his fields unreaped. But if his fruits, his wool, his wheat, escaped the fingers of thieves, and if he went on to leave his ground uncultivated, though the criminal law would not interfere, there are other modes of putting an end to the abuse. In the first place, the owner of neglected land would lose his income, and at the end of a few years would find himself in the hands of creditors, who would soon end the waste. But there is another and sharper remedy. Men of sane minds do not practice such abuses; and any one who indulged in them would soon find himself the subject of a writ *de lunatico inquirendo*, with a high probability of being pronounced by a jury, of unsound mind and incapable of taking care of his own property.

A landowner may, no doubt, turn a garden or a farm into a park. Land has been of late years appropriated

in such a way in Scotland. It is not so easy to do this in England, because a stringent poor-law, coupled with provisions of settlement, compel a landlord to provide not only for the infirm, the aged, and the impotent, but also for able-bodied men thrown out of employment.

The rights of property, in England at least, are very much limited by law. If Proudhon says that our laws are inconsistent with the Roman definition, I reply that the English care not a fig for Roman definitions: that they hold the maxim, property has duties as well as rights: and that if landowners generally were to be guilty of such abuses as are imagined, new laws would be enacted, stringent enough to correct the evil. The notion of such an absolute dominion over property, as will allow its possessor to oppress his neighbours by means of it, is quite obsolete in Great Britain.

Proudhon then quotes the definition given by the Constitution of 1793, and that given by the Code Napoléon. As however, in England we always avoid in legislation, everything like definitions or abstract resolutions, we can afford to laugh at the Constitution of 1793, the Code Napoléon, and Proudhon their interpreter. But, says Proudhon, property is of two kinds, right and possession: the tenant of a house or of a farm being the present possessor of it, but the landlord having the right, the permanent ownership. "This double definition of property, as ownership and possession, is of the highest importance; and it is necessary to get to the bottom of it, for those who would under-

stand what follows." For my own part, I cannot see the importance of the distinction for the purpose in question. We want to know whether it is right that one man should have exclusive possession of a farm, with power to cultivate it himself, to let it to another person on rent, to divide it or alter it as he pleases: whether also it is right that a self-denying man who saves part of his income should retain possession, to the exclusion of every one else, of his savings. That a tenant has present possession of a farm or of a house, whereas the ownership is in the landlord, is known to every one, but will help us little in solving our problem.

Proudhon quotes from Foullyer, a professor of Rennes, that there are but three absolute rights: those of *security, liberty, property*: he asks, however, why equality is omitted. He then endeavours to show that property is not a right of the same kind with security and liberty.

"First, as to liberty: it is inviolable. I cannot sell or alienate my liberty: every contract, every condition of a contract which should have for its object the alienation or suspension of my liberty, is null; the slave who sets foot on a free soil, is in an instant free." Even if this were true it would not be very convincing; since a right seems to be a right as against others and not as against myself. It might even be argued that my authority over my own property is more absolute than my authority over my own liberty. But who is ever convinced by such logic-chopping as this? Besides, the statement is overcharged. A man may traffic in his

own liberty and may to a considerable extent alienate it. I may hire myself as a clerk for a term of years, subject of course to the payment of a salary. After I have thus bound myself to another, who can claim my services ten hours a day and every day, during a long term of years, am I really free? Have I not trafficked in my liberty? I may engage in a merchant vessel as an able-bodied seaman, for a voyage round the world: will the captain release me until I have served my time? I may enter the line, or enlist as a dragoon: can I then be called a freeman? Though I cannot absolutely sell myself as a slave, I can do every thing just short of that.

But, says Proudhon, while the right to liberty is absolute, the right to property is only limited. "To supply the necessities of government, which has armies to maintain, works to execute, functionaries to pay, taxes are necessary. That all the world should contribute to these expenses, nothing fairer: but why should the rich pay more than the poor? That is right, says one, because he possesses more. I confess I do not understand such justice."

All these difficulties, verbal as they are, arise from starting with a definition. In England happily, we have no written constitution, no definitions of liberty, security, property. If the question, what is property? is asked among us, we understand, what is property with the rights actually attached to it; not what is property according to the Roman definition, or according to the definition of the "Code Napoléon," or according

to any definition whatsoever. We know by experience what property means among ourselves, and with that knowledge we are well content.

We then, in England, without any definitions to hamper us, have no difficulty in giving excellent reasons why persons should pay taxes in proportion to their property. Suppose a new colony determined to tax itself for the first time, in order to establish a police force. The assembled heads of families agree that a certain sum must be raised, and the only question is how it is to be furnished. The first proposition is that each of us shall pay 20*l.* a year: but I, a poor man, object to this, on the ground that such a payment will take all my surplus income, and will effectually destroy my chance of getting on in life. I add that by my side stands M. Proudhon, who has an income ten times as large as mine, and by whom a payment of 20*l.* a year will be unfelt. I ask if this be justice: to take from me a ruinous sum, and from my neighbour what will make no difference to him, whether he pays it or not. Let M. Proudhon in reply talk as much as he pleases about definitions and abstract rights: he will not escape an increased amount of taxation.

Many other reasons may be assigned why men should pay taxes in proportion to their means; or rather, why rich people should pay far more largely than poor ones: and indeed it may be contended very speciously that it would be an improvement if no taxes whatever were levied on the mere necessities of life, but all were levied on superfluities and luxuries. And this objection

of the injustice of graduated taxation, comes with a peculiarly ill-grace from one who as a communist is a professed friend of the poor. He ought rather to say that as in his opinion the poor ought to pay as much as the rich, as the rich are the legislators, and have yielded spontaneously their right to be taxed only as much as the poor, the poor ought to be deeply grateful for this concession. But Proudhon shows little sympathy with any class. Himself and his dialectical power fully occupy his mind.

Here is another passage showing the same love of dealing with words rather than things, and the same absence of feeling for the distressed. "In England there is a tax for the poor: I am called on to pay this tax. But what connection is there between my natural and imprescriptible right of property, and the hunger which torments ten millions of destitute? When religion commands us to help our brethren, it acts on a pretext of charity, not a principle of legislation. The obligation of benevolence, which is imposed on me by Christian morals, cannot impose on me a political right for the benefit of another, still less an institution of mendicity. I give alms if it is my pleasure, if I feel for the sufferings of others that sympathy of which philosophers talk, and which I scarcely believe in: I do not choose to be compelled. No one is obliged to be just beyond that maxim: *to enjoy your right so far as it does not trench on the right of others*: a maxim which is the proper definition of liberty. But my property is my own and owes nothing to any one: I oppose the

notion that the third theological virtue should be the order of the day."

We now see clearly enough what is Proudhon's notion of property: it is the right to do absolutely and without control, what I will with my own. To be consistent indeed, he should have gone a step further with regard to taxation, and should have denied the right of a Government to tax any man without his own consent, a consent expressed by himself and not merely by the representative of a majority. If an insurance company is established and offers me protection against risk of loss by fire, I accept or refuse at my own pleasure. If an association is established for the prosecution of felons, I am under no obligation to join it. My property is my own, and no company or association has power to interfere with my right. If the Government establishes a police force in my borough, why should it not act as the company and the association do: why should it not give me the option to avail myself of the police, or to refuse it, at my pleasure? On what ground, according to Proudhon's reasoning, can it make me pay a police-tax against my will? By doing this, does it not interfere with my right to the absolute and uncontrolled disposal of my property?

If Proudhon had been pleased to argue on the other side of the question, and this he would no doubt have done with equal ability and with far more sincerity, he would have retailed to his readers the learning of Montesquieu: he would have made much of the fact, that for ages past, property never has been held under that absolute

uncontrollable right which he now puts forth : he would have reminded us that though allodial lands were in remote ages held without dependence on any superior, yet that such a tenure has long passed away : he would have contended that all property being in modern times held in fee, that is in dependence on a superior, the notion of an absolute uncontrollable right is as much opposed to history as to good sense. Then, Proudhon would have delighted himself with an analogy. All lands, and everything upon them, were formerly held on the tenure of military service : my superior protected me in the possession of my property, and I in return was bound to accompany him in his wars at my own cost, for so long a time, and with so many men at my back. But the Government has taken the place of the former superior. Land is now held in fee of the Crown. Feudal tenures have been abolished ; the military claims on the vassals have been abandoned : but at the same time peaceful claims were established in their stead. The Queen nominally, the Parliament really, has succeeded to certain rights over the holders of property. The Government of the country has an hereditary, as well as a natural, right to call upon holders of property to pay taxes in proportion to their estates, for the support of local institutions, and for the maintenance of the poor. To myself this view of the case makes it no plainer than before, but it may serve as a set-off against the flimsy arguments advanced on the other side.

Property, says Proudhon, is robbery. But what do

you mean by property? The absolute and uncontrolled right to do what you will with your own: exemption from all claims to pay any more taxes than are levied on the poorest man in the land: freedom from all claims to maintain the destitute and starving. this is property. I reply that I agree with Proudhon that such property is a grievous abuse, a crying evil; though why it should be called a robbery I am not clear. But where does such property exist? In England? No: for there, what is called property is subject to a tax for the relief of the destitute. In France? No: for there, as in England, what is called property is subject to general taxes graduated according to its extent. If therefore, property is robbery, it is not to such property as is found in England and France, that the censure is applicable. Where then, is the force of the vaunted phrase, *la propriété c'est le vol*?

I do not propose to follow Proudhon through all his scholastic splitting of hairs. In one place, after considering and condemning the defence of property on the plea of occupation, he inquires into the validity of the defence on the plea of labour. He quotes from Rousseau; "The rich say in vain, it is I who built this wall, I have gained this land by my labour. Who has assigned you the boundaries? we may reply; and on what ground do you expect to be paid at our expense, for a labour that we have not imposed on you?" Proudhon says that no sophism can stand against this reasoning.

Let us now imagine Proudhon transported to Cayenne, and told by Government that he would be supplied

with the necessaries of life for one year, but that after that time he must furnish himself with everything. He at once selects a portion of ground of the most fertile appearance and in the best situation. He erects a log-hut, breaks up the soil, and sows his seed. The seasons come round, the harvest is reaped, and the settler finds himself possessed of a stock of grain sufficient for a year's consumption, and sufficient also for the purchase of other things that he wants. This grain is property. Ought it to be the property of the farmer by whose labour it has been produced? Is this property a robbery? From whom has it been stolen?

But Proudhon is desirous of improving his condition. He builds himself a substantial house and some farm buildings. These too are property: they are the results of his own labour. If these are a robbery, from whom have they been stolen?

So far as property results from labour, there really can be no room for disputing that it belongs to its producer. Now, let us consider the case of realty, by which I mean everything originally furnished by nature, and not the result of labour. Proudhon, after a few years' possession of his farm, finds that it is capable of improvement. Hitherto he has not troubled himself about a title, because the abundance of unoccupied land in the colony has removed all temptation on the part of other settlers to interfere with him. But now he reflects, If I drain this marsh with the labour of many weeks, if I expend so many more weeks in cutting ditches, if I employ myself during a month in improving

my roads, my farm will become an object of desire to other persons. Therefore, before I make a single improvement I will obtain a grant of my land.

Proudhon accordingly applies for a title and gets it. The farm is his, his own property: but not his in the sense which has been absurdly assumed, as though the grantee were to be free from all obligations towards his fellow-citizens. The grant is made on the condition implied and well understood, that the owner shall be subject to taxation in proportion to his means: to taxation both for general and local purposes. Now if this grant were made wantonly or even needlessly; if it were made to a person who would neither cultivate the soil nor permit others to cultivate it, so that the tract should be a barren spot, dividing settlers from each other; such a grant would be a wrong done to the colony: it might be called a robbery. But if the grant were made as I have supposed, to one who would improve the land by draining and road-making, so far from that being a wrong done to the colony, it would be a great gain to it; for there would be an increase in the wealth of the community; in its power to pay taxes, to support an army for defence, to establish courts of justice, schools, and all the apparatus of civilization.

Suppose the grant refused. Suppose the colonial governor said to the applicant, I have read your book, I am convinced that property is a wrong done to society; that to concede this land would be a robbery of your fellow-citizens: you may have possession of your farm, and I will guarantee that you shall not be turned out

of it so long as I remain governor. What would Proudhon do? Drain the marsh, labour at his ditches, break his back in levelling his roads? Nothing of the sort. He would not improve his land for the benefit of a creature of the next governor. He would light his pipe and pass his hours in sloth; and the colony would lose the advantage of his contemplated improvements. Certainty of possession is the foundation of all improvement of land: and improvement of land is the foundation of all social progress. So long as men are entirely occupied on unimproved ground, in raising the resources of life, there is no surplus fund, no leisure class, no means of promoting intellectual and moral improvement. Is property in land then, a robbery of society? Is it not rather a boon conferred on all as well as on the possessor?

But this kind of reasoning is just that which Proudhon despises and detests. It is drawn from observations and facts, not from pure reasoning. He is a man to whom, I should think, mixed mathematics must be odious. What! learn astronomy partly by observation? If the existence and course of the planets cannot be deduced from geometrical considerations, he minds not about them, and will scarcely believe that the heavenly bodies exist. What cares he that the progress of society, its wealth, its civilization, rest on the appropriation of land? If the right to appropriate cannot be proved from *a priori* considerations, he will none of it. Let society perish and syllogisms flourish.

All men will agree that there is such a thing as

justice: that men ought to be guided by it; and that they are to some extent guided by it. But if you ask a number of thoughtful persons why they feel bound to be just, each man will give you a different answer. The quietist will tell you that a good frame of mind requires it; the pietist that he acts justly from a regard to the glory of God; the rationalist that he desires in living justly, to work out his own salvation; one moralist that the good of society requires him to act justly; another that he feels within him an admiration and a desire for what is just, and that it is this, and not the welfare of society, which actuates him. Men like Proudhon would deny that such a thing as justice exists, or that at any rate it is obligatory on men, until all these varying opinions can be reconciled. The expediency of property is to most men as clear as the obligation of justice.

But Proudhon, not satisfied with his opinion that property is a robbery, contends that property is impossible. I should have supposed that what is impossible cannot exist, and that therefore, property as it does not exist, cannot be a robbery. The phrase should be, property, if it existed, would be a robbery. But what a miserable trifling must that be which denies the possibility of property!

That I may be free from the suspicion of misstatement, I quote the opening sentences of the chapter in which this impossible opinion is propounded.

“The last reason of proprietors, {the crushing argument, the irresistible power of which sets them at their

ease, is that, as they say, equality of conditions is impossible. Equality of conditions, they cry with a self-satisfied air, is a chimæra; divide possessions into equal portions to-day, to-morrow this equality will have disappeared.

“To this common-place objection, which is repeated everywhere with incredible assurance, they never fail to add the following comment by way of *Gloria Patri*: If all men were equal, no one would choose to work.

“This anthem is sung to many airs.

“If every one were master no one would choose to obey.

“If there were no rich, who would set the poor to work?

“And if there were no poor, who would labour for the rich?

“But no recriminations: we have a better answer.

“If I prove that it is property which is itself impossible; that it is property which is itself a contradiction, a chimæra, an Utopia; and if I prove it, not more by considerations of metaphysics and right, than by means of numbers, equations, and calculations, what will be the alarm of the astounded proprietor? And you, reader, what think you of the rejoinder?”

I am not about to follow Proudhon through the verbiage by which he proposes to demonstrate that property is impossible. There is an unreality about the thing which takes away its interest, unless for a few students who delight in a logomachy for its own sake, just as some coarser persons delight to behold a

prize-fight, without any interest in its results. Robert Hall discussing with a friend the merits of Thomas Aquinas and the schoolmen, in reply to an observation that those authors formed an excellent field for the exercise of the intellect, said; that they could not be called a field, a term that implied fertility, but that they might be called an arena, which is barren. Proudhon's disquisition on the impossibility of property is an arena, not a field of discussion. After all that he can say, his readers will still revert to the irresistible answer: but such an one possesses property, you possess it, I possess it; how then can it be impossible? He reminds us of the slave in Lucian, who professed to his master that he was such a firm partisan of the sceptical philosophy as even to disbelieve his own existence. The master, finding other arguments unavailing, beats his slave with his club, until he makes him confess that he suffers, and that whatever suffers exists. Such discussions are pretty toys for youths, but are quite unworthy to occupy the minds of men who have outlived the age of debating-clubs.

The satisfactory character of Proudhon's argumentation, may be judged of by its opening sentences. "Numbers govern the world, *Mundum regunt numeri*: this maxim is as true of the moral and political world as of the sidereal and molecular. The elements of law are the same with those of algebra; legislation and government are nothing but the art of classifying and balancing powers: the whole of jurisprudence consists in the rules of arithmetic." We are here irresistibly

reminded of the scene in the *Bourgeois Gentilhomme*, in which it is proved to demonstration that music and dancing govern the world.

"*Music-master*.—All the disorders, all the wars which are seen in the world, happen from ignorance of music.

"*Dancing-master*.—All the misfortunes of men, all the fatal reverses with which history is crowded, the oversights of politicians, and the short-comings of great captains, all have happened through not knowing how to dance.

"*M. Jourdain*.—How is this?

"*Music-master*.—Does not war happen from a want of union among men?

"*M. Jourdain*.—That is true.

"*Music-master*.—And if every one learnt music, would not that be the means of bringing them into harmony, and of causing universal peace?

"*M. Jourdain*.—You are right.

"*Dancing-master*.—When a man has committed a blunder, whether in his domestic affairs, or in the government of the state, or in the command of an army, do not we always say, such an one has made a *mauvais pas* in a certain affair?

"*M. Jourdain*.—Yes, we say so.

"*Dancing-master*.—And to make a *mauvais pas*, can this arise from any cause but ignorance of dancing?

"*M. Jourdain*.—That is true, and you are both right."

Music, dancing, and arithmetic, are doubtless the three powers by which the world is governed.

Here is another jingle of words remarkably fitted to elucidate the subject of legislation about property. "In proving the impossibility of property, I at the same time prove its injustice; in fact,

"That which is just, is *a fortiori* useful;

"That which is useful, is *a fortiori* true;

"That which is true, is *a fortiori* possible;

"Consequently, that which issues from the possible issues for that reason from the true, the useful, and the just. Therefore, *a priori*, we may judge of the justice of a thing by its impossibility; so that if this thing were sovereignly impossible, it would be sovereignly unjust."

How it can be predicated of an impossible thing, that it is unjust, I am at a loss to conceive: and I am still more puzzled, if possible, to know what legislation has to do with things which are not, and cannot be in existence.

To complete the picture of Proudhon's absurdities, I give the heads of the arguments by which the impossibility of property is demonstrated.

"*Axiom.* Property is a *droit d'aubaine* which the proprietor claims as a thing marked by him with his seal.

"1st proposition. Property is impossible, because it exacts something out of nothing.

"2nd proposition. Property is impossible, because wherever it is allowed, production costs more than it is worth.

"3rd proposition. Property is impossible, because on a given capital, production is in proportion to labour, not in proportion to property.

"4th proposition. Property is impossible, because it is homicidal.

"5th proposition. Property is impossible, because where it exists society consumes itself.

"6th proposition. Property is impossible, because it is the mother of tyranny.

"7th proposition. Property is impossible, because in consuming what it receives it destroys it, because in saving it, it annuls it, because in capitalizing it, it turns it against production.

"8th proposition. Property is impossible, because its power of accumulation is infinite, whereas it has to do with finite quantities.

"9th proposition. Property is impossible, because it is powerless against property.

"10th proposition. Property is impossible, because it is the negation of equality."

Here are nine propositions, each of them demonstrating that property is impossible. Most persons will be of opinion that one simple proposition is a sufficient answer.

Property is possible, because it has existed, does exist, and will continue to exist.

If Proudhon replied with contempt, that by property in his reasoning, is not meant what is vulgarly understood by the word, but what philosophers and jurists understand by it, I reply that it is absurd, in writing

of what is familiar to every man above the level of a savage, to give any meaning to a word but that which it universally bears. Myriads of men, quite incapable of defining, are quite able to understand precisely what property is, and it is in this sense that the word is and ought to be taken.

But Proudhon delights in giving an unusual signification to a term, because this enables him to gratify his vanity by giving vent to a startling paradox. Thus he says; "What form of government shall we prefer?—Can you ask such a question, replies, no doubt, one of my young readers; you are a republican.—Republican, yes; but this word has nothing precise. *Res publica*, that is the public thing; then whoever desires the public weal, under whatever form of government it may be, may call himself a republican. Kings also are republicans.—Well! you are a democrat?—No.—What! a monarchist?—No.—Constitutional?—God defend me!—You must be an aristocrat?—By no means.—You are in favour of a mixed government?—Still less.—What are you then?—I am an anarchist.

"—I understand: you are satirical; this is intended for the government.—In no sense: you have just heard my profession of faith, seriously and deliberately adopted: although I am decidedly a friend of order, I am in the full force of the term, an anarchist. Listen."

Then come several pages of quotation and dissertation, after which in a note, we find; "The meaning commonly attributed to the word anarchy is absence

of principle, absence of rule; from whence it comes that it is used as synonymous with disorder."

But what miserable trifling is this! To take a word, not in the sense in which it is understood, but according to its etymology, is worthy of a schoolboy, or of an artizan who has just mastered the rudiments of speech. And this, we are to presume, is the result of Proudhon's application to language and its laws. We have seen that after he became an exhibitor of Besançon Academy, he devoted a *whole year* to philology and grammar. I am tempted to agree with Pope, that a little learning is a dangerous thing.

But I have quoted enough of this odious trifling with grave matters. I conclude with a rant which ends this essay in the original. "O God of liberty! God of equality! God who put into my heart the sentiment of justice before my reason understood it, hear my ardent prayer. It is thou who hast dictated whatever I have written. Thou hast formed my thought, thou hast directed my study, thou hast weaned my mind from curiosity, and my heart from attachment, that I might publish thy truth before the master and the slave. I have spoken according to the power and the talent which thou hast given me; it is for thee to finish thy work. Thou knowest whether I seek my interest or thy glory, O God of liberty! Let my memory perish if only mankind may be free: let me see in my obscurity the people at last enlightened; may noble instructors inform them; may disinterested hearts guide them. Shorten, if it may be, our time of trial; may

pride and avarice lie buried under equality; confound that idolatry of glory which holds us in subjection; teach these poor children that in the bosom of liberty there are neither heroes nor great men. Inspire into the powerful and rich man, into him whose name I will never mention in thy presence, horror of his rapine; let him be the first desirous of making restitution, may the promptitude of his regret secure his absolution. Then shall great and little, learned and ignorant, rich and poor, unite in ineffable fraternity; and all shall join in singing a new hymn and in restoring thy altar, O God of liberty and equality!"

CHAPTER VI.

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION OF 1848.

SECTION I.—Louis Blanc in power—How it happened—Commission of labour at the Luxembourg—First Proclamation—Hours of labour—Task-work—Abolition of middle-men—Sempstresses' petition against gaol-labour competition—My opinion—The *Maison Leclaire* system—Adopted by the *Presse*, &c.—Imperfect obedience of masters

It does not often happen that men who propound new theories of social organization, have the opportunity of applying them to practice. Plato was not entrusted with the construction of a city: More never contradicted the title of his book, by giving a locality to his Utopia: Harrington was not the architect of an aristocratic republic, with Cromwell for its temporary dictator. St. Simon became a social innovator only at the close of a long life; and Fourier did not survive to see his phalanstères disturb the world. But Louis Blanc, having adopted the communistic principles, having modified them, popularized them, and given them currency, found himself, while in the vigour of life, in a position to carry his scheme into full effect. I propose in this chapter to remind my readers of the circumstances under which this opportunity arose, of the mode in

which it was made use of, and of the strange results that followed. As only ten years have elapsed since the events in question, a mere sketch of them is all that is necessary. I do not pretend to any sources of information beyond those which are open to every reader of the *Times* newspaper and the *Edinburgh Review* : but by selecting those paragraphs which have especial reference to the question at issue, I may put the transactions in a point of view more striking than any that offered itself even to the diligent among daily readers.

It will be remembered that the revolution of 1848, grew out of a banquet intended to be given on the 22nd February, by persons favourable to a reform of the French electoral system. The news which arrived in this country a few days before the 22nd, was to the effect that though Louis Philippe's Government, with Guizot at the head, was unfavourable to the gathering, yet that there was no cause for alarm. Then we were told that ten thousand National Guards would be present at the banquet, but that they would be conservators of the peace, and that their motto was *liberty and public order*. The Government was not to interfere forcibly, but was to station one commissary of police at the door of the hall, with orders to protest against the banquet. The proceedings were to be limited, after the banquet, to one toast and one speech. A hundred thousand troops stationed in Paris were felt to be a sufficient guarantee of order.

On Monday, the day before the one fixed for this

great demonstration, a question as to the intentions of the Executive, was asked in the Chamber of Deputies, by Odillon Barrot, who was beginning to be stigmatized by the popular party as too rich and too timid for their purposes. The ministry replied that the banquet would not be permitted. Then broke out a rebellion, which banished the Orleans dynasty, which deluged Paris with blood, which renewed some of the anarchical scenes of sixty years earlier, which threw into confusion all the relations of employers and workmen, which wrought up the minds of the lower classes to such a state of mania as threw them into the arms of the red republicans, causing, four months later, a frightful battle of four days within the walls of Paris; and which has placed France for the present in the power of an Emperor, unrestrained by any constitutional bonds, and left at liberty to fashion his administration at his own pleasure.

On the 22nd there was no banquet. But instead of it there were countless crowds on the *Boulevards*, before the *Madeline*, and thence to the *Place de la Concorde*; with singing of the *Marseillaise* and the chorus of *Mourir pour la Patrie*. Occasionally there was a peaceful charge of Cavalry, but with so little violence that an observer thought it worth noting that one man had his head cut open. M. Marrast, the editor of the *National*, and soon to be a responsible minister, appears on the scene, unpleasantly reminding the reader by similarity of name, though not in anything of real importance, of *Marat the*

Murderer, the colleague of Robespierre and Danton. Later in the day there were some feeble attempts at barricades, and the *rappel* was beaten to assemble the National Guard.

The next news that reached England was headed, "The revolution in Paris;" and an account was given of downright fighting in the streets, of volleys of musketry, and hostile charges of cavalry. One broken head attracted little attention this day. Guizot resigned, and Molé was closeted with the king.

On the 24th Louis Philippe abdicated, and left Paris in such haste that he was almost in danger of wanting necessaries in his hurried journey. There had been more fighting, and Thiers had been sent for, but it was too late. Doubtless the old king thought of Louis XVI. and the guillotine. The next day Paris was illuminated as for a victory, and dear has that victory cost her, for scarcely since that time has she had a day's peace and content.

My business is not to write a history of the revolution, but only to show how Louis Blanc and his followers came to be invested with the power to put their schemes into practice. I therefore pass over all the exciting incidents related by M. de Lamartine, a summary of which will be found in the *Edinburgh Review* for January 1850. I will merely quote a passage containing the reasons assigned by the writer of the article for charging Lamartine with conspiring to overthrow the monarchy. "We have seen that at about eleven o'clock, a deputation from the republican con-

spirators, including representatives of the *National* and the *Réforme*, proposed to him to substitute for Louis Philippe the Comte de Paris as king, and the Duchess of Orleans as regent, and to place *him* over them as minister: that he objected to their scheme that such an arrangement would not last; and declared himself in favour of a republic based on universal suffrage. That they expressed their conviction and separated—being all agreed apparently on the course of action to be pursued.”

After we have thus been admitted behind the scenes by M. de Lamartine, we cease to be surprised that the Chamber of Deputies refused to listen to the Duchess of Orleans, though she had the courage to present herself before them with her sons. She staked boldly and lost.

A Provisional Government came into existence. I do not say that it was appointed, for after reading the following statement made by one of its members, I cannot say so. “When we reached the Hôtel de Ville, to take possession of the Government, we found, in the little room in which we passed the night of the 24th and 25th of February, MM. Marrast, Flocon, Louis Blanc, and Albert, who had got there before us. *Who are you?* we asked. *Members of the Provisional Government*, they answered. *By whom appointed?* we inquired. I think that they answered, *By the Democratic Society*. If we ourselves had been asked who appointed us, we might have answered that we were appointed in the Chamber of Deputies, but

certainly not *by* the Chamber. Our only origin was a popular acclamation,—and they claimed the same title. So we took them as secretaries,—and afterwards as colleagues.” Thus were installed in office as a Provisional Government, M.M. Arago, Dupont de l’Eure, Albert (ouvrier), F. Marrast, F. Flocon, Lamartine, Marie, Louis Blanc, Crémieux, Ledru Rollin, Garnier Pagès.

Behold Louis Blanc then, placed in high office, as one of a small committee to whom is intrusted the political and social destinies of a great kingdom. I am now in a position to sketch the course he adopted; to show how he carried into effect the theories which he had before eloquently enforced.

Louis Blanc was intrusted by his colleagues with the administration of a new office, not very clearly defined, but which may be regarded as a sort of ministry of labour. The Palace of the Luxembourg was assigned to him; and the workmen with whom he consulted, might soon be seen sitting on the benches lately occupied by the Peers of France. In less than a week after Louis Philippe’s abdication, the following proclamation showed what was going on.

“THE FRENCH REPUBLIC.

“LIBERTY, EQUALITY, FRATERNITY.

“PROCLAMATION.

“Citizens.—The Committee appointed by the Government to inquire into the grievances of the labouring classes, entered on its functions this day (1st March).

On the benches lately occupied by privileged legislators, the peers of France, the people seated itself in turn, by way of taking material possession of its right, and marking the place of its sovereignty.

“Labourers, your comrades discussed before us the interests which are dear to you, with the calmness and dignity becoming free men. We have heard their wishes, and in order that they may be speedily realized, we have agreed that each profession should choose a delegate to attend the Government Committee.

“Until the Government Committee be completed by the choice of the delegates of the different professions, we will proceed to settle the questions relative to the hours of labour and the abolition of job-work.

“Now, citizens, hasten to resume your labours. Bear in mind that every hour’s delay is a treasure lost to the country. You are one of the bases, and the object of the special solicitude of the Provisional Government of the Republic. It loves you: confide in it, and rest assured that it desires your happiness as impatiently as you do yourselves.

“The people has gained by its courage an ever-memorable victory, and will immortalize its triumph by its wisdom.

“(Signed) THE MEMBERS OF THE PROVISIONAL
“GOVERNMENT.”

The employers of workmen must have read this proclamation with some alarm. The question of the shortening of the hours of labour, is a grave one. In

England we have found it possible to interfere in this matter as far as regards the great factories engaged upon textile fabrics; but we have not seen our way to do anything as to labourers generally. It would be very difficult to enforce a law forbidding masters to employ men more than ten hours a day; and a law that cannot be enforced, is far worse than useless.

But the most dangerous point touched upon in the proclamation is that of task-work. Though the advantages of task-work are obvious, yet objections have frequently been raised; and some years back, a large body of working engineers in the north of England struck work to enforce a demand that all men should be paid by the day. If indeed, employers were permitted to pay wages varying according to the supposed value of each man, there would be nothing unfair in principle; because the quantity and excellence of each man's work would be observed, and the rate of remuneration would be fixed accordingly. But this would be task-work in a clumsy form: and such an arrangement would not have been satisfactory to the engineers I have alluded to; their intention being that all workmen, old and young, adroit and clumsy, idle and industrious, should earn the same amount. In respect of justice such an arrangement is manifestly indefensible. The only pretext for it, is, as far as I know, that all men must live; that the unskilful man has as much need of food, clothing, and shelter, as the expert man has; and that the rate of wages ought to be determined by the necessities of the receiver, and not by his ability.

This is, in truth, a naked form of communism. Men are to labour for their comrades and not for themselves. All are to share alike in the earnings of the community. It was therefore not unnatural that the French communists should desire the abolition of task-work.

I am glad to observe however, that this change was not afterwards insisted on. No doubt the Parisian mechanics saw that if it were carried out, the principle on which it was founded would require in its full development, that all labourers in whatever occupation, should receive the same remuneration; that the water-carrier from Auvergne should have as liberal wages as the highly-skilled chaser or decorator: since the man who trudges about all day with a load on his shoulders, has at least as much need of food and warmth, as the man who has little fatigue in his vocation.

A far more popular demand, and one that was constantly urged, was the abolition of middlemen. It is, I believe, far better that workmen should be engaged and paid directly by a manufacturer, than by foremen who hire secondary labourers with a view to make a profit out of them. But the direct hiring is in many cases very difficult if not impossible. To say nothing of mines and public works, carried on quite away from the inspection of a principal, even in a manufactory the practice of employing middlemen is sometimes inevitable. A workman is intrusted with valuable materials. After having done a little towards converting them into finished goods, he draws some money on account, but instead of returning on the Monday or Tuesday to

complete his task, goes off on a drinking bout, and perhaps is seen no more for a fortnight. The manufacturer pays another person to complete the goods, and suffers a considerable loss. Can it be reasonably expected that this thoughtless workman shall be again intrusted with the means of injuring an employer? Is it for his own interest that he should be so intrusted? It seems to me far better that he should hire himself to some steady foreman, who working by his side all day can exercise an useful restraint over him; who will not allow him to get into debt, and who, if he should absent himself for a few days, can dispense with his services. This hypothetical case is in truth a real and a frequent one. While therefore, I highly approve of the resolution of many large manufacturers to engage and pay all their hands themselves, without the intervention of middlemen, I am convinced that there are numerous instances in which this wholesome determination cannot be carried out.

The next notice that I find as to the Luxembourg Commission is as follows. "The cause of this comparative quietude (of Paris) is no doubt, the formal establishment of the *Commission des Travailleurs*, which is now holding its sittings at the Luxembourg, in what was the Chamber of Peers. The benches so recently occupied by these pillars of state are now occupied by the representatives of labour. There the economic questions of their condition are formally discussed: M. Louis Blanc takes the most prominent part in the debates. The results produced up to the present time

are partial enough; the demands of the deputations that have crowded the Hôtel de Ville have been granted. The hours of labour have been shortened by a decree: manual toil is limited (reduced) in Paris, from 11 hours to 10 hours, and in the provinces from 12 to 11. The grievance of *marchandage*, or what we should call the practice of taking small contracts by an individual standing between the employer and the actual workmen, is remedied, as far as a decree can do it; no labourers are henceforth to be *exploited* for the benefit of one of their own class. Some exceptions are made however; taking work *by the piece* is permitted where a number of men choose to do so, sharing the wages equally according to the amount of labour done. Whether these regulations will work remains a doubt. The Government cannot inspect every workshop of a nation; and in the infinite varieties of occupation many things are convenient in practice which run counter to perfect theory."

I will mention here another demand, though it was not made till nearly a fortnight later than those I have mentioned. "A numerous deputation of sempstresses on Wednesday, waited on the Government, to demand that work in prisons, *ouvroirs*, and communities, should be put an end to, on account of its creating a competition which it was impossible for them to struggle against. M. Pagnere replied that the Government had already taken measures with respect to work in prisons, and would occupy itself with the question relative to work in *ouvroirs* and communities, so as to do

away, not with the work, but with the competition it created."

I believe that in this instance the Government was quite in the right. I have always looked suspiciously at prisoners' labour: but after a good deal of consideration I arrived some years ago, at these conclusions. That the employment of prisoners (or of other persons already maintained) does not diminish the demand for free labourers; because the results of the prisoners' labour lessens the tax levied to support them, and leaves the amount so saved to be spent in the employment of other labourers. If a certain prison makes goods worth 1,000*l.*, the tax levied to carry on the prison will be less by the same sum; and the rate-payers will have 1,000*l.* to spend either on their own maintenance, or as capital. The second conclusion is that there is just that danger which the Parisian sempstresses point out: the danger that the goods produced in the prison should be sold in the market in such a way as to lower the remuneration of industry. The governor of a gaol is a manufacturer who gets his labour for nothing. In making his calculation of the cost of his goods, he omits the very important item of wages paid: and thus he may offer his mats, or shoes, at a much lower price than free men can make them at. This is really an interference with the wages of honest men. The remedy is obvious: it is to make such commodities as can be used within the prison itself or in other public establishments; taking care not to use the cost of these prison-produced articles as a standard

for regulating purchases out of doors of other articles for the prison. This is exactly what the Provisional Government seems to have contemplated, in saying that the work must go on but that the competition should be put an end to.

In a previous section, devoted to the theories of Louis Blanc, I noticed a scheme of partnership between employer and workmen, as actually carried out by the *Maison Leclaire* in Paris. This organization seems to have met with a good deal of favour; and we find two important concerns adopting it at this juncture. The first of these concerns was the Northern Railway: the second, the leading journal, the *Presse*. As to the latter we find; "The proprietors of *La Presse* met on the 5th instant (March), M. de Beville President; M. de Laboy Secretary; M. Contzen Auditor: (having been called together by M. Emile de Girardin) and agreed unanimously to the principles hereafter stated, already adopted by the company of the Northern Railway.—Association of labour and capital—division of profits. Henceforward, in every industrial enterprise, all the salaries of labourers, workmen, foremen, clerks, engineers, directors, and managers, shall be made a common fund with the capitalists, with reference to the labour of the one and the capital of the others. The profits remaining, after the payment of labour and the dividends on capital, and for providing a sinking-fund to pay off the capital, shall be divided between all, according to the amount of salary or dividend of each. In consequence they decide that the division

of the proceeds of the *Presse* shall be made as follows:—1, Payment of salaries;—2, Interest on capital at 5 per cent., according to the average profits of the *Presse*, from the 1st August 1839, the day of its purchase, comprising therein the sinking-fund;—3, Division of the profits in the proportion of capital in money to capital in labour, represented by the amount of salaries. This word salaries must have some more noble import. The proprietors of the *Presse* therefore extend it, without distinction, to editors, clerks, compositors, correctors, printers, distributors, and folders. The accounts of the participation shall commence from January 1, 1848. A commission composed of three members has been charged with the drawing up the legal agreement."

I am not aware what were the results of this organization, nor how long M. de Girardin and his friends continued it. In the *décrets de l'avenir*, published a few years later, nothing, as far as I have seen, appears in praise of this communistic scheme. The Provisional Government as may be seen in the work of Ramon de la Sagra, discussed the propriety of a general adoption of this organization, but condemned it on the ground of the difficulty of ascertaining from time to time what the profits of a business really were; and especially in the case of farming, in which the gains are uncertain and frequently slow.

This proceeding however, on the part of the *Presse* and of the Northern Railroad, was altogether of a private character. But the Luxembourg Commission

did not hesitate to take a part, as opportunity offered, in making arrangements between employers and workmen. Thus we find that "M. Louis Blanc, the President of the Government Committee appointed to adjust the claims of the labourers, had fixed the salary of the drivers and conductors of omnibuses at $3\frac{1}{2}$ francs a-day (nearly 3s). M. Blanc had, moreover, considerably reduced the amount of the fines to which they were liable, and decided that their proceeds should in future specially belong to the conductors and drivers, and form a fund for the benefit of the sick and wounded, their widows, &c."

It will be readily believed that the attempts made by the Provisional Government, to regulate the hours of labour and the rates of wages, would be imperfectly obeyed; and that men wanting work, would be apt to agree secretly with their former masters, to take the remuneration to which they had for years been accustomed. So early as the 13th March we find a warning to masters, that "The strict and faithful execution of the measures taken by the Provisional Government is an affair of public safety, and they will be firmly maintained." And, again, on the 24th March we learn that "the decree abolishing the practice of *marchandage* (the middle-men system among *ouvriers*) not being generally obeyed, the offence is now made punishable by fines of 50 f., 100 f., and 200 f., for a repetition of the offence, and imprisonment for one month to six if the practice is persisted in." With a settled Government like our own, there is infinite difficulty in carrying

out regulations affecting the relation of master and workman; as, for instance, with regard to the truck system: what could be expected in France, a country in a transition state, torn by internal dissensions, and the battle-field of a monthly revolution.

SECTION II.—Direct employment of labourers by Provisional Government—National workshops opened—What they were at first—Make-believe labour out of doors—Shoemaking and tailoring—Rate of wages paid—Proceedings at Havre—Labourers unreasonable—Number employed in Paris.

I come now to the still more important topic, of the direct employment of the people by the Provisional Government. Within two days after the abdication of Louis Philippe, a number of decrees were issued from the Hôtel de Ville. Of these, the 19th,

1. Engages to secure the existence of the workman by employment.
2. Engages to secure employment to all citizens.
3. Admits that workmen ought to combine in order to enjoy the fruits of their labour.

It has been remarked that these engagements and this admission, are little more than the concessions which have long been made to English workmen. To this an answer has been given, that our poor-law engages to furnish maintenance but not employment. But I do not see much in this distinction; because the unemployed operative requires employment as a road

to maintenance, and the absence or enforcement of work is to him a secondary consideration. The real evil seems to me to have consisted in the hasty nature of the proceeding. It is no doubt highly desirable that France should have a poor-law to protect the indigent from starvation; but such a poor-law should be passed with deliberation, and should be carried out with all possible caution. Yet, before we throw stones at Lamartine's Government, we should remember the precarious nature of our own position as to our conduct in Ireland just before this very period. In our benevolent endeavours to mitigate the consequences of an awful famine, we had extemporised a charitable organization, which, in some of its results, was as unfortunate as the hurried measures of France in 1848.

The decree I have mentioned was soon put into execution. The national workshops were opened immediately in the outskirts of Paris. "A person who wished to take advantage of the offers of Government, took from the person with whom he lodged a certificate that he was an inhabitant of the Département de la Seine. This certificate he carried to the mairie of his arrondissement, and obtained an order of admission to an atelier. If he was received and employed there, he obtained an order on his mairie for forty sous (about 1s. 7d.) If he was not received, after having applied at all of them, and found them all full, he received an order for thirty sous. Thirty sous is not high pay; but it was to be had for doing nothing; and hopes of advancement were held out. Every body of eleven

persons formed an *escouade*; and their head, the *escouadier*, elected by his companions, got half a franc a day extra. Five *escouades* formed a brigade; and the brigadier, also elected by his subordinates, received three francs a day. Above these again were the lieutenants, the *chefs de compagnie*, the *chefs de service*, and the *chefs d'arrondissement*, appointed by the Government, and receiving progressively higher salaries. Besides this, bread was distributed to their families in proportion to the number of children."

This extract is taken from the "Edinburgh Review" for January, 1850; and any one desirous of fuller information, may obtain it from the *Histoire des Ateliers Nationaux*, by Emile Thomas. The election of the foreman (*escouadier*) by the labourers themselves, is an ingenious process for securing the least possible amount of work. A just and energetic foreman would soon have been deposed.

The term national workshops may create an incorrect impression, as to the kinds of work done under the supervision of the Luxembourg Commission. On the 13th March, we are told that the public works had been resumed with considerable activity, and that no less than four or five thousand labourers were employed in filling up the fosses round the Champ de Mars. Three days later, it is said, that considerable works were being carried on in the neighbourhood of Paris, as well as in the city itself, by means of the national workshops. More than 200 men were employed in levelling the road on the side of the hill at Courbevoie:

while other improvements were in progress on the roads from Paris to Strasburg, from Vincennes to Nogent-sur-Marne, and in other directions. All these were undertaken principally as a means of employing the people. With this view, in the garden of the Luxembourg, the whole extent of the ground occupied by the shrubbery, was converted into a garden in the English style; 200 workmen being thus occupied.

Great difficulty was experienced in furnishing work for the great number of men who applied for it: and three weeks after the date of the last information I have quoted, a complaint was made that while money was disappearing, credit at an end, trade nearly at a stand, the artificial employment found for workmen was nearly exhausted. The Parisians were aghast at seeing comparatively few engaged in their legitimate pursuits, and at hearing that 200,000 to 300,000 able-bodied men were at the command of the highest bidder. We shall see, however, that these numbers were exaggerations.

Six weeks after the Provisional Government had come into existence, an eye-witness gives this description of the labours carried on. "That demonstrations of a more violent kind must find vent sooner or later, will be very evident to any one who thinks it worth his while to wander to the Parc de Monceaux, where such of the workmen out of employ as still choose to make any show of working at all, are occupied in *make-believe* work. Make-believe indeed! for not even children could be seduced into the belief that they were doing

anything of real utility. In this large park, now entirely opened to the public, still more desolate-looking at present than it was after the ravages committed in it during the first days of the revolution, several hundreds of men are occupied in making a show of digging up earth, wheeling it to a heap, and when the heap is big enough demolishing it again, to wheel the earth elsewhere, and so on, with no more result than if they were so many Danaides filling a bottomless tun. Sometimes, when the futile absurdity grows too much for them, they wheel their superintendent about like schoolboys for want of any better occupation. But in general they have far better sport than this. They form *al fresco* clubs of several hundreds, and it is only necessary to listen to them for a few minutes, to learn with what kind of demonstrations they intend to enliven the capital at no very distant period. They have got far beyond Louis Blanc and his utopian talent-levelling theories for the organization of labour. Communistic doctrines to their utmost extent are their favourite subjects for declamation."

Other occupations, however, were tried. For example; towards the close of April, as announced by the *Presse*, workshops were established in Paris, for the employment of destitute shoemakers and tailors. They were engaged in making apparel for their comrades, and were afterwards to work for the troops. In this case there was danger of causing as much, or more, distress than was relieved. If the coats and shoes made in the national workshops, supplied a demand that would

have led buyers to private shops, there was a diversion of employment from the ordinary channels into artificial ones: a change which might gratify the followers of Louis Blanc, who would make over all manufactures to the State; but which appears most dangerous to persons not inoculated with these wild doctrines.

The wages paid by the Commission, cannot be charged with extravagance, when reckoned by the day. At first a man received about 1s. 7d., and a boy 10d., with an addition of bread to families. Shortly afterwards, the rate was reduced on the regular public works; and the men having consequently struck, M. Marie, the Minister of Public Works, addressed a proclamation to them, adjuring them in the name of patriotism to return to their employments. This reduction, however, did not apply to the rate I have given above, which still continued at 1s. 7d. a day; with an allowance of 10d. a day to those for whom employment could not be found.

At Havre, the municipality supplied the place of the Luxembourg Commission in Paris: but great complaints were made of the unreasonable attitude assumed by the workmen. From the middle of March till the middle of April, 2,000 men were employed at 1s. 7d. a day, although the finances of the town were at that time embarrassed. The public employers were dissatisfied with the labourers because they had not the honesty to earn their wages; and still more so when they threw obstacles in the way of lightening the burden. The general Government had some earthworks to execute,

and with a view to relieve the municipal finances, offered the Havre authorities the performance of the task. The offer was accepted, and the municipality hoped to be able to improve the condition of the labourers, by setting them to task-work. The price commonly paid was 30 centimes the cubic metre; the price now offered was one-half more than this: and a robust man could earn, it is said, 2s. 9d. a day at this rate, instead of 1s. 7d. by day-work. In order to give a further stimulus to industry, the payment for day-work was reduced to 1s. 2d. This arrangement was received thankfully, or cheerfully, by the industrious: but the idlers, happily a minority, protested, declaimed, threatened violence, and proceeded so far that it was found necessary to stop their mouths by force. Such is the account given by the Havre journal; and though there may possibly be another side to the case, it is so consistent with what would naturally happen, and with what did happen elsewhere, that I am disposed to believe it substantially correct.

It is not extraordinary that the Parisian workmen should desire a higher rate of pay, and they were not wanting in a sufficient degree of unreasonableness. Among the many clubs formed after the events of February, few were more violent than the one at the Conservatoire presided over by Blanqui. This is the man whom Lamartine describes as having at a secret meeting poured out to him his whole soul. "He told him the history of his life, which had been passed in plotting against every Government under which he had

lived: he described his passion for a woman who had shared his sufferings until they had killed her: his solitary meditations; his religious aspirations; his dislike of bloodshed: and, at last, his irresistible craving for conspiracy; a taste which long indulgence had made a second nature." This man at his club on the 18th April, proposed that the minimum of wages should be paid at 4s. a day; besides a provision to be made by the rich for the sick and aged. If Blanqui were sincere in the religious aspirations he spoke of, it might have been expected that before he stimulated the working classes to a hope of having their wages doubled, he would have inquired whether such a change were possible. If he had done this, he would probably have been convinced that if the whole rents, profits, and salaries of France, were made over to the workmen, they would not have nearly furnished such wages as he talked of.

As to the number of men employed, or paid, by the Luxembourg Commission, there would of course be very conflicting statements. We have seen already an exaggerated report of 200,000 or 300,000; a number which would include all men of military age in Paris. A subsequent statement was to the effect, that probably by the end of April there would be 75,000 Parisians out of employment: and a calculation was made, that at the rate of a franc and a half a day, there would be an expenditure of nearly a million and a half sterling a year. It would have been well if the numbers had stopped at this point: but by the middle of May we

find them increased to 115,000 men; and as these were doing little of any real utility, it was proposed that such of them as were immigrants should be required to return to their native places: (a kind of law of settlement). A few days later it was believed that the number paid, wholly or partially, amounted to 200,000, and was still increasing. But about this time, an analysis was made, and it was found that of the 75,000 men nominally employed out of doors in Paris, 12,000 were foreigners, 20,000 were deserters, 20,000 were provincials, and only 23,000 were Parisian workmen. The entire number employed by the Commission at this time was stated to be 115,000, but suspicions existed that this was an exaggerated estimate. There is little doubt, however, that in June, before the organization was destroyed by the four days of civil war, the numbers rose as high as 110,000 to 115,000.

SECTION III—Poverty of Provisional Government—Rise of prices—Public declamation against capital—Lamartine's protest—Increasing demands and discontent—Danger that the workmen should lend themselves to the Red Republicans—Increasing ill-feeling between the lower and middle classes—Cavaignac and his troops—The crisis—Real destitution—Barricades—The fatal four days—End of the national workshops

The evils caused by this extravagant proceeding are sufficiently obvious. The first pressure that was felt by the Provisional Government was that of poverty, caused partly by the expenditure at the Luxembourg.

Within three weeks of the revolution, an amusing correspondence was reported, or imagined, as having taken place between two of the Ministers: M. Arago, the Minister of Marine, and M. Garnier Pagès, the Minister of Finance.

"My dear Garnier Pagès: I want money for the expenses of the works in the outposts.

"My dear Arago: I have none.

"My dear Colleague: You jest.

"In no respect.

"Then, with whatever regret, I must cause the works to be discontinued."

Money, however, was found; and not only for this folly, but for others equally deplorable. One of the unfortunate consequences that followed immediately upon Government interference and the consequent augmentation of wages, was a rise in the price of articles manufactured. The *cochers* having secured a tariff, with an advance of wages, the tailors demanded the same. The cheap selling shopkeepers were in despair, for the classes they supplied could not afford to pay more than before. One of the employers stated the case to his men, and received for answer, that when society was regenerated, everybody would be able to pay five pounds for a coat. A tailor, with a family to maintain, and condemned to wait for the regeneration of society, would be a pitiable sight.

But one of the most formidable of the mischiefs caused by this social revolution, was the opportunity it gave of preaching to the multitude the grossest false-

hoods, under cover of the existing Government. Here is a sample of a speech at a club, by a man who might plead that he said little more than had already been published by Louis Blanc, the head of a great department of Government.

“Capital is the sole oppressor in the world: the workman the only person oppressed. Whether it be capital undergoing the changes and modifications of history, successively personifying itself in the Brahmin, the Spartan, the patrician of Rome, the magnificent *seigneur* of Venice, the gentleman of France, or the noble lord of England: or whether it be the workman, outcast, slave, serf, Irishman, or *prolétaire*, laboriously moving in the circle of progress, transforming himself by degrees, conquering new rights, and mounting step by step the various grades of the social hierarchy;—still we meet the same causes producing the same sanguinary and disastrous effects. The strong and powerful of each succeeding century, have perfectly understood that the foundation and continuance of their domination rested on the coöperation and support of public opinion. It was necessary to lull the consciences of the people to sleep, to consecrate the legitimacy of usurpation in the eyes of all, and to cause this tyranny of many weighing so heavily on the inert masses, to be accepted as a necessity and of divine right. They have therefore taken priests, poets, and historians into their pay, charged to make this plot, laid against the liberties of all, succeed by terror and ignorance. Thence arose those theories, as impious as absurd, that a great many poor were

necessary, in order that an elect few might enjoy the blessings of life; that the earth is a valley of tears and a field of never-ceasing trials; that God distributes unequally the favours He accords to His children; that the fatal lot of the mass is patient repugnant labour, long-suffering, and resignation. *It is capital which causes at this moment* (a month after the abdication of the king) the financial crisis, which shackles credit, paralyzes industry, and arrests commercial transactions: alarmed capital, unproductive and parasite capital, which holds at its mercy the industrial and the workman, which deducts from them the largest and purest part of their labours; which hides itself, contracts and reduces itself to nothing, and throws confusion into the whole social body. Now, shall we suffer any longer a handful of cowards to drain the sources of labour and national prosperity? Shall we suffer a few men, of whom the majority are not even Frenchmen, to hold in their hands the fate and destiny of France? . . . The people desire neither vengeance nor reaction. Let then these pusillanimous and cowardly men keep what they have acquired; but let us no longer leave in their hands that power which they have so badly used. Society, in guaranteeing the rights of labour, has taken the rule of a social providence. It requires a civil list in harmony with its fresh wants. Let us take away from the parasites, from the intermediate agents and unproductive idlers, the enormous profits that they are realizing every day, to the detriment of all, upon production and consumption. Let us make over to the state, which is the

association of all interests, the monopoly of the great industries; the monopoly of banks, of roads and communications, the two great levers of commerce, the monopoly of assurances, the monopoly of all colonial produce, &c. In these measures only is safety and a remedy. A law of later date would regulate the indemnities to be accorded."

This speech evidently was made by one who had read and thought, and who especially had become familiar with the disquisitions of Louis Blanc and the other communists. No wonder that uneducated and excitable men, listening to these fervid declamations against the rich and all the possessors of property, and regarding the doctrines propounded as being under the special protection of the existing Government;—no wonder that the workmen of Paris should have been led to believe that a new era of labour was at hand, and that henceforth it would be an easy task to live; and no wonder either, that the extravagant hopes excited led afterwards, when their vanity was exposed, to scenes of frightful violence and bloodshed.

Lamartine states, that at an early period of the Provisional Government, he saw clearly the difficulties which the Luxembourg Commission was raising up; and that there must inevitably arrive a crisis when a violent struggle would decide the fate of regular government. He says that he and his friends continued to hold power longer than they desired, because they thought it cowardly to desert the vessel of state while she was in weekly expectation of a storm, which their colleagues

had conjured up. The tempest came at Midsummer, and a struggle of four days justified Lamartine's prescience.

I think it right to recall to recollection, that the Luxembourg Commission was the work of a portion of the ministry, and was yielded in haste and under pressure by Lamartine and his friends. We cannot reasonably expect to find in a poet and orator, any very clear apprehension of the truths of political economy. But Lamartine, in the following remarks, has protested at least against those extravagant doctrines which I have quoted. He says that political economy "ought not, as formerly, to be the science of wealth. The democratic republic ought and will give it another character. It will make of it the science of fraternity, the science by the results of which not only will labour and its fruits be increased; but by which a more general, more equitable, and more universal distribution of wealth amongst the people, will be accomplished. Ancient science tended only to *render individuals wealthy*, but our new science will apply itself to make the entire people rich. Between the theories which are presented to attain this object, there are some false, some doubtful, and some true. It is for you to precede the Government in enlightening it in the choice of practical means to excite labour, and to raise the condition of the masses without diminishing the well-being of manufacturers and landed proprietors; and particularly *without interfering with the free employment of capital, which disappears* as soon as its independence is menaced. To conciliate property, that foundation of family, that

source of population, that emulation of agriculture, with the liberty of labour and the increase of wages—such is the problem; any other is an error—it is a subversion in place of an amelioration. The Republic was not created to destroy, but to ameliorate the conditions of labour and property. Make it your study to resolve this problem in the spirit of the new and regular Republic which France will have, and forget not that in order to solve it, one divine principle which sanctifies all others must be inscribed above all our theories—God, the people, and fraternity.”

This speech was a reply to an address by the Society of Political Economy. The very name might have taught Lamartine, that the aim of the society was something far different from the art of rendering individuals wealthy. But we can forgive mistakes of this kind, in consideration of the distinct protest against the subversive doctrines of the clubs, and of some members of the Provisional Government. If Lamartine could have induced his colleagues to take all their measures in such a way as not to interfere with the free employment of capital, the miserable consequences that followed would have been avoided.

But Lamartine and the other moderate men could not control Ledru Rollin, Louis Blanc, Flocon,² and Albert. With every addition to the national workshops there was, on the part of the labourers, an increase of insolence and discontent. Labour was the source of all wealth, therefore all wealth ought to belong to the labourer. All property was a robbery; and those who

had filched the possessions of the many, ought to make restitution. Such notions generally entertained, and almost sanctioned by authority, made a hundred thousand men ready for a servile war, in which wealth and ease might be the prizes of the conqueror. Working men, whose greasy garments befouled the benches on which the peers sat but yesterday, might be excused if they imagined that the millennium of labour had arrived. But however pardonable their delusion, the existence of society required that it should be corrected. Take away the right to possession and free use of capital, and the reign of barbarism returns.

As far as I can form an opinion on a matter not easily understood, the danger which threatened Paris, was not merely that the hundred thousand workmen should rise in a mass and demand unreasonable concessions. Although they were organized in squadrons and regiments for the purpose of labour, yet in a military point of view they would have been a mere mob. The real risk was that this vast body of angry men should become a formidable tool in the hands of conspirators. There were in Paris, and there long had been, a considerable number of clever, audacious villains, with "hearts to conceive, heads to plan, and hands to execute any mischief." These were the Red-Republicans. They watched the proceedings of the Luxembourg Commission, doubtless, with a ferocious joy, and a thorough contempt for Louis Blanc and his theories. As the demands of the workmen and their discontent augmented, they fanned the flame, and

quietly prepared their plans, waiting for the right moment to put their tools in motion.

It will be remembered that on the 15th May, the populace had forcibly entered the hall where the National Assembly was sitting; that a cry had been raised in favour of Poland; and that, above all, there was a determination expressed, by the crowd to compel the Chamber to commence at once the task of supplying the wants of the workmen. The National Guard appeared in large numbers, and the *émeute* was put down; but much irritation remained on both sides. From this time the meetings of the Assembly were protected by a constant force of the National Guard. But the members of this unpaid force got tired of being constantly on duty; and one of them is reported to have said to a discontented workman—"It may be good sport for you, but to us this beating of the *rappel*, and this parading under arms in the presence of a blazing sun, and when all that remains of our trade requires our undivided attention, is no joke."

At the beginning of June it was observed, that among the crowds on the Boulevards there were an unwonted number of grumbling workmen, declaiming with energy and animation, and exhibiting an unusual degree of waspishness. The National Guards, patrolling to keep the thoroughfares open, were the subjects of audible murmurs, of remonstrances, and of open insults. The workmen had, evidently, learned the lesson carefully inculcated by the clubs, of distrust and hatred towards the middle classes.

In the mean time Cavaignac had been appointed Minister of War, and he had displayed great activity and energy in urging forward preparations for the probable conflict. The regular troops, who had been removed from Paris after the 24th February, had been gradually marched back again; so that it was said early in June, that there were sixty thousand of them in Paris and its vicinity.

At last the Provisional Government brought matters to a crisis, by adopting measures to lessen the numbers of workmen in their pay. On the 23rd June, much alarm was felt in Paris, when it became known that the men had been assembling from an early hour, and had declared their intention to go *en masse* to present a petition to the Assembly. Government was on the alert; and was protected by Cavaignac and his *old Africans*, without whom, as he is reported to have said afterwards, the rioters might have predominated. Some feeble attempts were made to erect barricades: the shops in the Boulevards were closed: quiet people stayed at home.

The Government, in pursuance of its resolution to reduce the public workshops, had ordered the provincial workmen to return to their native places. They had selected 3,000 of these; had marched them outside the barriers, and had supplied them with some money and with orders for maintenance on the road. The men, instead of starting homewards, remained outside the city, spending their little fund; and, in the afternoon, 400 of them returned and presented themselves

at the Luxembourg. Not receiving a satisfactory answer, they became noisy and riotous. Other bodies of larger dimensions took a similar violent course.

All the old conspirators in Paris, all the Red-Republicans, all the liberated galley-slaves and unconvicted villains, all who desired to satisfy their fanaticism or their sensual passions, were of course on the alert. The clubs had not yet been closed. In many of these the most violent denunciations were uttered against the Government; and the people were stimulated to demand the release of the arch-rebel Barbès, and if refused this boon, to march to Vincennes and set him free by force.

These instigations were only too successful. No doubt, many of the working classes were in great distress. During four months Paris had been in a state of constant disturbance; thousands of English and other foreign families had left as fast as they could obtain passports: there had been a great falling off in the demand for goods and in the employment of servants: the cries of the terrorists had led men to hoard instead of employing their funds as capital: the Government interference had greatly reduced the activity of private traders: nothing but peace and security could restore the means of living. Hunger adopts desperate remedies. A gentleman visiting some of the barricades that were erected, found the men civil but resolute. He asked one of them why he was engaged in this frightful occupation. The man folded his arms and looked at him for some minutes, and

then said, "Because I starve. I have a wife and four children. I receive at the mayoralty 11*d.* a day. That is not enough to buy bread for us, cheap as bread is. Come home with me and you shall see for yourself. Afterwards, I will return to the barricade. I am hungry, but I will not eat: I will get killed." The gentleman went home with him and found things as they had been described. The man returned to the barricade.

The storm broke on Paris in all its violence. Barricades were erected in such numbers that five hundred are said to have been counted in one faubourg. Every passer by was required to put his hand to the work, as every traveller formerly added a stone to the monumental barrow. The correspondent of the *Times* was called upon to pay this tribute to rebellion. "I was stopped, I cannot say how often, and requested to contribute towards erecting the barricades by throwing up one paving-stone: a contribution which no one could refuse making to any barricade in construction that he passed. *Un pavé s'il vous plait*, said they with infinite civility. However, as I had no time to lose, I managed to pass everywhere, by telling them that I was a physician going to visit patients." A perilous falsehood if detected.

It will be remembered how determined was the fighting on those fatal four days. Happily, the bodies of regular troops who had been brought back into Paris, behaved excellently. So did the Garde Mobile, formed of all the young pickles who before February had run wild about the streets. The National Guards seem to have

been rather backward in making their appearance; but those who took any part behaved with resolution. The long-continued battle was a bloody one, and is said to have cost the Government ten general officers and ten thousand troops, killed and wounded. The insurgents suffered less because they fought from behind entrenchments, strongly constructed, and regularly loopholed for musketry. In many cases the barricades were turned by breaking through the houses on either side, but where this could not be done, great numbers fell on the side of the assailants.

Thus were extinguished with blood the national workshops of Louis Blanc. It is not perhaps fair to lay to their charge all the carnage of the four days; because, after all, the workmen who were assembled and maddened by unfounded hopes and inevitable disappointment, were but tools in the hands of the Red-Republicans. At the time of this battle, indeed, Barbés and Blanqui were incarcerated at Vincennes. But others of a similar stamp were in Paris. One is mentioned in particular, M. La Roque, who, though a professed ultra-republican and editor of the *Père Duchesne*, was a man of education as well as of talent. He fought in the February revolution, and started the Club of the Mountain, a name that sufficiently indicates the sentiments of the founder. "He necessarily became the patron of the galley-slaves and desperadoes, who tendered their arms and their lives, on the understanding that they were to be rewarded by uncontrolled plunder and carnage." Detesting these ruffians he

became their leader, and fell fighting during one of the four days of June. The dress found on his dead body was an outward expression of his conflicting sentiments: a blouse and a pair of clumsy shoes concealing a cambric shirt and silk stockings. Such men as these made use of the discontented workmen as their tools: they organized them: they put themselves at their head: they gave to their desultory proceedings an order and regularity without which they would scarcely have been formidable. On the other hand, but for the national workshops, which assembled and irritated scores of thousands of vigorous men, these reckless conspirators would have remained in obscurity. Generals without an army are at least as powerless as an army without generals.

SECTION IV —Louis Blanc's language as an official person—Document issued by the Commission—Facts alleged—Reconciliation of masters and workmen—Reduced hours of labour—Bakers' strike—Pavlovs' strike—that of the drivers—that of the tilers subdued by appeal to patriotism—Various other cases—Established associations—that of tailors at Clichy—of saddlers—of spinners—Conclusion.

Those who are acquainted with the theories professed by Louis Blanc when he was a private person with no hopes of attaining to power, will be curious to learn what form his opinions assumed when he found himself installed in office, and subject to all the responsibilities of a public career. Had he foreseen his destiny, he would perhaps have mitigated the expression of his opinions: just as in the British Parliament, members

of a minority, when a ministry is tottering, are guarded in their speeches, fearing to commit themselves to impracticable measures. Whatever might have been Louis Blanc's conduct if he had possessed the gift of prescience, he did, in ignorance of the future, tie himself down to extravagant opinions as to the relations of capital and labour. The following pages will show how far his declarations in office were consistent with his professions as a private man.

This section contains a document issued at the end of April, by the Luxembourg Commission, of which Louis Blanc was the head. It extends to a considerable length, but it is a very readable production, and gives a clear, though one-sided, account of the actual proceedings; and I think it right to let the innovators tell their own tale:—

“Scarcely announced and installed, the Commission was able to enumerate by disasters all the effects of an economical system. A society shaken to its very foundations, owing to the too long application of a subversive principle—such was the prospect of the Commission. Trades ruined and crying for assistance, workshops in confusion, interests at war, workmen and masters divided by daily disputes, undertakings suddenly stopped, state interference loudly claimed by the proprietors of factories, state protection invoked with anguish or anger by a host of operatives driven to their last shift—such is the spectacle which has brought under our notice the system of competition reduced to give a formal account of its miseries.

“But, on the other hand, it was easy to perceive a fundamental tendency in this diseased society, if not general, at all events very energetic, to encourage generous attempts, and to endeavour to organize a better system of labour.

“To meditate with ardour the code of the *prolétaires* to be emancipated, whilst silently preparing the materials—in short, to confine ourselves to solitary studies, would not have sufficed. Placed in the midst of a confused medley of interests, pressed by the clamours of misery, seized by the most legitimate impatience, we had to listen to complaints, to allay irritation, to settle differences with impartial benevolence, to maintain the tranquillity of Paris by a permanent system of arbitration, to welcome the operatives who offered to establish fraternal associations—colonies of the future by the side of a tottering past.

“It does not appertain to our province to explain the dangers of such a mission. In the midst of the most frightful distress, in the tempestuous intoxication of a revolution, under the weight of the most urgent necessities, and with the full consciousness of their strength, the working classes by whom we have lived surrounded, have constantly behaved with calmness and confidence. Facts speak for us.

“RECONCILIATIONS.

“Summoned daily as arbitrators between masters and workmen, we intervened whenever our interference was accepted by both parties. A large number of

reconciliations were thus effected. We will only mention a few, on account of their extreme importance: for the peace of the capital was staked on the issue.

“And first, we have been generally reproached for having decreed the diminution of the duration of daily labour. Well. apart from the considerations of justice, humanity, and sound economy, which appealed in favour of that measure, it is right that the public should know the question to have been, on the day following the revolution, one of civil war. What was our course, however? Notwithstanding the ardent, and apparently irresistible demands addressed to us, we boldly refused to decide anything before we had consulted the heads of establishments; and having assembled them in large numbers, they at once consented to the demands of their men; so equitable did it appear to them to yield, so perilous to refuse.

“Paris was not aware that on the morning of the 29th March, the inhabitants rose without any prospect of bread. The journeymen bakers formally refused to go on working, unless their painful situation were amended at once. They came to the Luxembourg in thousands to expose their sufferings and their resolutions. All the bakeries were deserted without any intention of return. The masters hastened to us in consternation.

“The delegates deputed by the masters and the workmen, discussed (thanks to our intervention) all the details of their respective situations. At length an amicable arrangement was effected: a tariff was

adopted, which gave general satisfaction: and these thousands of men, whose toil supplies the first necessities of the city, retired grateful and moved. Paris was supplied the next day as usual; and the inhabitants did not even dream that they had been reduced to the verge of starvation.

“Some days previously, the traffic of Paris had been doubly menaced.

“It was at first the pavement of the streets which still kept up the revolutionary movement. No vehicles could pass. Now the paviments refused to clear the thoroughfares, and demanded higher terms. Recognized as legitimate, in an open discussion between masters and workmen, the demands of the workmen were admitted, and the streets resumed their wonted appearance.

“But no sooner had the pavements been replaced, and the traffic rendered possible, than the vehicles came to a stand-still in all parts of Paris. At first it was the omnibuses, *favorites* &c.; next, the hackney-coaches and cabriolets—in short all the public vehicles.

“For several days a similar discussion took place. At length an agreement was made, and the traffic was everywhere renewed.

“It became necessary to construct a provisional hall for the meetings of the new National Assembly; the old Chamber of Deputies not being spacious enough for the accommodation of the representatives of the Republic. At the very moment when the works ought to have been pushed forward with the greatest activity

(the opening of the Assembly drawing nigh), the tilers descended from the roofs, and refused to go up again, owing to some dispute with the contractors. Our intervention was again required, and as soon as we had appealed to their patriotism, the tilers offered to labour gratuitously for the Republic: a generosity which the Republic could not accept, for it thenceforward owed a second stipend, one of gratitude.

“ These reconciliations are sufficient to show what we have effected. The whole list would be too long. There are few branches of trade which have not appealed to us: we will only mention the mechanics of the *atelier* of Derosne and Fail, those of the *atelier* Farcot, the paper-stainers, the zinc-workers, the straw-hat makers, the nightmen, the washerwomen of the environs, &c.

“ It should be remarked that it was most frequently the masters that were the first to solicit our arbitration, and to impart their embarrassments to us. The masters and the men approach the Luxembourg by different roads; they almost invariably depart by the same road.

“ The memorandums of these reconciliations are deposited in the archives of the Commission, attested by the signatures of all parties: modest records of labour and of concord.

“ ESTABLISHED ASSOCIATIONS.

“ Whilst thus labouring to reconcile divided interests, we also wished to connect the future with the present by certain new creations. Several important associa-

tions have been founded by our care, and these societies are now at work in the middle of Paris.

“The old (debtors’) prison at Clichy is transformed into one vast workshop. The journeymen tailors, combined in one association, are there executing great works for the State. We subjoin a few details of the organization and condition of the society.

“The principle on which the association of tailors rests, is fraternity. A moveable one, it is always open to the working-man who presents himself at its gates, asking for work, and accepting the fraternal conditions of the house.

“Those conditions are, equal wages for all the associates, equal partition of profits, and activity in application.

“A jury, appointed by election, is entrusted with the maintenance of order, and, if necessary, decrees exclusion from the society.

“Three delegates, also elected by the association, represent and administer its affairs conjointly with a ministerial Commission.

“The Commission of examination controls the acts of the administration.

“The Governmental Commission for workmen is represented in the association by an agent, M. Frossard.

“The association is installed, and has been at work since the beginning of April.

“The State has given it orders for 100,000 tunics, at ten francs each (8*s.*), and 100,000 pantaloons, at three francs each (2*s.* 5*d.*), for the use of the stationary

National Guard (the cloth being supplied) and for 10,180 tunics at 8s. 10d., and 10,180 pantaloons at 2s. 5d. each for the Garde Mobile.

"These works are being executed by about 1,200 associates. Besides which, the association employs a large number of female breeches-makers out of doors.

"Notwithstanding the expenses of starting and of materials, the association has already a profit to divide: moderate it is true, as all first profits must be, but presenting at once hope and encouragement for the future.

"The considerable number of workmen who presented themselves during the first few days, and who were obliged to take part in labour insufficient to employ so many hands; the somewhat disorderly influx of the National Guards, who rushed in crowds to the doors of the workshops, to ask for their clothes; and the inexperience of the management, so natural in the outset, at first occasioned some confusion. But measures for restoring order were taken: and now the associated workmen, some assembled in the large hall of the old *parloir*, the others dispersed in groups throughout the cells, are working with the generous ardour which is inspired by the certainty of developing a fruitful idea. *What a noble spectacle* in the midst of struggles of universal antagonism, to behold this great assembly of men united by bonds of the closest dependence! *What a touching sight* to behold this prison becoming the first asylum of real liberty!

"The barracks of the Allée des Veuves, in the

Champs Elysées, have received a second society, founded on the same principles of fraternal devotion. The saddlers are there working for the equipment of the cavalry. The journeymen spinners, assembled in a third association, have also received large orders from the State.

“New societies present themselves every day to the Commission, with their plans and their statutes, soliciting aid and acceptance. The masters of factories, on their side, come and offer their workshops to the State, and place at its disposal their implements of labour; some actuated by generosity, and others by an intelligent calculation of chances.

“Judging by the force of the current which is carrying away the fragments of the old state of society, the transformation, unless a crisis supervene, will be easy and speedy. The impulse, in short, is given, and is irresistible. Everything impels, and is impelled, towards the principle of association—the saving system, which will sooner or later be blessed by those who now decry and calumniate it. The system of competition and antagonism, that is to say, of hatred and anarchy, of disorder and war, abdicates its sovereignty in the bosom of the calamities which it has produced. Perhaps its fall may be retarded by a few temporary compromises; and for our parts we shall not refuse to do our best to prop up this old edifice which is cracking and crumbling on all sides. The public may rely upon us, upon whom, since the revolution of February, this perilous and ungrateful necessity has only entailed fatigues almost

superhuman, abuse, calumnies—and calumnies, too, on the part of the very persons whose security we were protecting at the risk of our popularity, sometimes at the risk of our lives. But let there be no mistake. The time for vain palliatives has passed away. A desperate disease requires sovereign remedies.”

This is the whole of the report that was published at one time; but a few days later a large addition was made to it, and if I had had room to spare, I would have given the whole of it. The style of what I have printed, reminds me a good deal of Louis Blanc's work, the *Organization of Labour*; some allowance being made for the responsibility of office. We cannot be surprised that he was the subject of attacks, which he calls calumnies, but which may have been only a true expression of honest indignation. The master tailors, the master spinners, the master saddlers, had reason to complain that their trade was filched from them, their men enticed away, their shops and factories deserted, their capital annihilated. They would not be the less angry, and they would feel fewer scruples at expressing their feelings, from the conviction they would certainly entertain that the Government would be worse supplied, and that the blouses and saddles would cost far more than they had hitherto cost; because the salaries of superintendence, the peculation and jobbery and mismanagement, would be far more expensive than the ordinary profit of the capitalist.

If we are to credit the sincerity of Louis Blanc (and I have no reason to doubt it), he continued, after some

months' experience, to believe in the advantage of direct employment by the State of all labourers. He had, in fact, no time for reflection about principles, no opportunity for that earnest meditation of which he speaks. His opinions had been blazoned abroad beforehand: he was chained to the oar, and his only hope of security lay in those superhuman exertions which he declared himself to have made. His labours, however, were in vain. A few days after the last of the public statements, of which I have quoted one, he and his colleague Albert were driven out of the Luxembourg. A few days later occurred the invasion of the Assembly (15th May); and Louis Blanc, naturally suspected of being accessory to this violence, would have been prosecuted, but that his friends induced the Assembly to refuse its consent. Louis Blanc is now in London, wearing out his heavy years as an exile; but happier even thus than when overloaded with an unnatural responsibility. Albert is said to be living wearily in prison; regretting, no doubt, that he ever threw off the redingotte of an editor, to assume the blouse of a mechanic and falsely to call himself Albert (*ouvrier*).

CHAPTER VII.

EMILE DE GIRARDIN.

LA POLITIQUE UNIVERSELLE.

Décrets de l'Avenir

SECTION I.—History of the book—Irreligious ideas—General notion of contents.

IN the previous chapters I have given an outline of the most noted schemes of the French innovators, and of the results exhibited in the year 1848. But we naturally inquire with anxiety, what effect was produced on the minds of our neighbours by all these strange outcries of pseudo-philosophy, and by the consequent agitations of the revolution. We might have anticipated that the solitudes and terrors of the months during which the Red-Republicans projected their dark shadow over Paris, would have sickened the whole nation of schemes of novel organizations, and would have led them to acquiesce in those social arrangements which have received the sanction of centuries of experience.

The daily papers, as we know, play no inconsiderable part in the formation of Parisian opinion; and M. Emile de Girardin, as editor of the influential journal *La Presse*, has long occupied a high position in the eyes of the

world. During the revolutionary period, the *Presse* adopted the partnership system recommended by Louis Blanc, after the pattern of the *Maison Leclaire*; but took, nevertheless, an independent tone in commenting on the proceedings of the communists.

M. Emile de Girardin, several years later, was driven into exile. We may fairly suppose, then, that the serious misfortunes which fell upon France and on himself, must have sobered his mind, and made him represent the prudent and conservative section of publicists rather than the wild and innovating section.

He employed his short banishment in writing the work, the name of which stands at the head of this chapter; and a perusal of which will show us what style of opinion was formed by the previous history, and recent experience, of a great *soi-disant* statesman.

The book, as the author tells us, was written and printed at Brussels, during the two months he resided there in consequence of the decree of the 9th January, 1852. A second edition was printed at Paris in October, 1854; and this being eagerly bought up, a third edition (the one I make use of) was issued in 1855. But though it was written hastily, it was, we are told, the result of long reflection. M. de Girardin apologises for its imperfection, not on the ground of want of meditation, but because he had left in Paris the notes that he had long been amassing. He calls his work, for this reason, an imperfect sketch of a picture, to the completion of which he proposes to dedicate his life. He says that during three years he had

applied himself constantly, and almost without rest, to the solution of the question, how the people in order to be free might be neither subject nor monarch. If each of the important topics here discussed occupied his attention an equally long time, M. de Girardin must be a much older man than his baptismal register would show.

M. de Girardin is certainly a bold man, for he utters statements of opinion which on this side of the Channel would exclude the book and its author from what is called respectable society. We are moderately tolerant of every shade of Christianity; and we do not close our doors against a quiet professor of Deism: but a man who publishes his conviction that there is no God and no future life, will find himself in as bad odour with decent society as with a court of justice. Yet when M. de Girardin utters such sentiments as the following, it may be that he knows himself safe in the sympathies of his brother Parisians; and it is not easy to believe that so experienced a journalist could be much deceived on so grave a matter. He assumes:—

“That God has no existence; or that if he exists, it is impossible for man to demonstrate the fact.

“That the world exists of itself, and of itself solely.

“That man has no original sin to ransom.

“That he bears about him memory and reason, as flame bears with it heat and light.

“That he lives again in the flesh only in the child that he begets.

"That he survives intellectually only in the idea or the deed by which he immortalizes himself.

"That he has no ground for expecting to receive in a future life a recompense or punishment for his present conduct.

"That, morally, good and ill do not exist substantially, absolutely, incontestably, by themselves: that they exist only nominally, relatively, arbitrarily.

"That, in fact, there only exist risks, against which man, obeying the law of self-preservation within him, and giving law to matter, seeks to insure himself by the means at his command.

"That the means he employs have changed and will again change; but that the aim is always the same.

"Morally, what is it that is called good?

"Morally, what is it that is called wrong?

"If murder is called a wrong, what name should be bestowed on war? Why acquit war and condemn murder?

"If robbery be called a wrong, what name should be given to conquest? Why acquit conquest and condemn robbery?

"From the risk of attack springs the necessity of defence.

"From the necessity of defence arises the thought of association.

"From the thought of association have been born, under different names, the commune and the nation, the one being to the other what the handful is to the sheaf."

Such is the statement of M. de Girardin's very startling opinions upon morals and religion. Upon these as a foundation he has constructed ten chapters or books; which, with the addition of a recapitulation and some copious notes, constitute the work I am describing. I will give the titles of the chapters, in order to furnish a general notion of the entertainment provided.

First Book : Universal Insurance.

Second Book : Universal Pacification.

Third Book : Universal Inscription.

Fourth Book : Universal Suffrage.

Fifth Book : Universal Education.

Sixth Book . Universal Justice.

Seventh Book : Universal Dowry.

Eighth Book : Universal Tenths.

Ninth Book : Universal Property.

Tenth Book : Universal Self-Government.

It will be readily believed that there is much which is new and surprising in several of these chapters. We may guess what is to be said about universal pacification, suffrage, education, justice, self-government; but most persons not familiarly acquainted with Parisian literature, must be puzzled to conjecture what is to spring out of universal insurance, inscription, dowry, tenths, and property. The result of an examination will perhaps be quite as astonishing as the anticipations formed from the titles.

UNIVERSAL INSURANCE.

SECTION II.—Universal insurance the same thing with universal policy—My objection that the two things are not the same—National insurance impossible—Self-interest the foundation of morality—Right and wrong, a calculation of risks—Quotation from Bias.

After laying down the principles I have already quoted, M. de Girardin goes on to explain what he means by universal insurance. He takes the term in a sense much wider than anything we have been accustomed to. We are familiar with insurance against fire, against maritime dangers, against destruction of crops by storms, against bad debts: and life insurance is brought daily before our eyes by newspapers and agents' brass plates. But we are here called upon to extend our notions, and to regard insurance as a far more important thing than we had hitherto conceived.

The work opens with the statement that universal policy, in the opinion of the author, is the same thing with universal assurance. A few pages later, he says: "The calculation of chances applied to human mortality, to maritime risks, to the cases of fire or inundation, has given birth to a new science, which is at present in its cradle:—that of insurances. The calculation of chances applied to the life of nations, to the cases of war and revolution, is the foundation of all profound policy. According as this calculation is rigorous or false, well understood or slighted, policy is glorious or fatal, great or little. To govern is to foresee: to foresee nothing is not to govern, it is to rush to destruction. What is a

banished sovereign? What is a deposed despot? What is a dethroned conqueror? The day on which Napoleon wrote; *I depend upon circumstances, I have no will, I await the issue of events*; that very day, the Emperor was Emperor no more; he was only a man who weighed less in the balance of human affairs on the 22nd June, 1815, than M. Crochon, a member of the Chamber of Representatives.

"I have always been governed by circumstances. In this confession of Napoleon is the explanation of his fall."

This quotation does not throw much light on the topic of the chapter. No one will dispute that a man who walks blindfold through a town will probably be run over: or that another who shuts his eyes to the risks of speculation will probably become bankrupt: or that a third who ignores the risks of war will in the end be beaten: or that a fourth who gives the reins to political circumstances will in the long run become their victim. Universal policy, then, may be called the calculation and avoidance of risks. But how does this connect itself with the question of insurance?

If I throw fire about my house, with an obstinate disregard of hazard, I must expect some day to be burnt out. But this would be true if the practice of insurance had never arisen. If I lived as a farmer, in a country of frequent hailstorms, my crops would be from time to time destroyed. And this misfortune occurred but too often, long before insurances against such risks could be effected. We all know what is

meant by insurance; but our very familiarity with the practice makes it difficult to explain what it is. We may look at it simply in this way. A thousand farmers pay a pound a year each; in the course of the year one of the subscribers suffers by a hailstorm to the extent of 1,000*l.*: he takes the subscriptions. During a second year two other farmers suffer each of them a loss of 500*l.*: and these two divide the common fund. This is insurance in its most simple form. The object proposed is the removal of an inevitable loss from one man to many. The loss continues the same, but it falls differently. Instead of ruining one sufferer, it only slightly injures a number. To apply this system to national policy, M. de Girardin must show us that a national evil, such as war, can be removed from the shoulders of one nation and can be distributed among many; and can be so distributed that each nation on whom it falls can bear it easily. Where are the thousand nations, where are the hundred, where are the ten, that can enter into a bond of mutual assurance? Besides, insurance can only be effected as to matters in which a money estimate can be formed. If a man insures his house, he may rebuild it when it is burnt: but he cannot replace a favourite picture, or an heirloom of china: much less can he have his own life restored if he is smothered or consumed in his bed. Now the expenses of a war are only a part of the many evils it causes. There are also the pouring out of the citizens' blood, the distressed circumstances and broken hearts of survivors, the destruction of friendly intercourse, the

hindrance to domestic improvements. How can these be insured against?

We might expect then, to find M. de Girardin proving to us that nations might if they chose, enter into arrangements which would have the same effect that is produced by insurances against fire and shipwreck: that they might by coöperation distribute at least the pecuniary losses of war over a large surface, and thus prevent the occasional ruin that falls on a single State. Instead of this, he first of all makes a scientific division of risks into those which exist of themselves, and those which spring from our social state, and he then shows that there has been a constant tendency to a diminution of both these classes.

In the first division he puts hazards from wreck, lightning, fire, hail, frost, inundations: in the second he gives us war, piracy, murder, robbery, fraud, violence. As to the first he says that science by its victories over matter, has much diminished the risks. The improvements in ship-building, the invention of the compass, scientific maps, the use of steam, have reduced the dangers of voyages. The metallic conductor has warded off many a thunderbolt. The stone-built and tiled building escapes from the dangers of fire which were imminent in the case of wooden and thatched houses. The introduction of potatoes (an unhappy example) and an improved cultivation, have reduced the instances of dearth or famine.

As to the second class of dangers, those caused by society itself, M. de Girardin is of opinion, that the best

way to lessen violent offences would be, to observe universally the precept never to do to others what you would not that they should do to you: and he would have these words engraved on every door of a court of justice, on the obverse of every coin, at the head of every contract, and in the memory of every child.

So far the author may be perfectly right. It may be true that risks generally have greatly diminished, though his political economy might be found fault with: as for example, where he makes the precarious potato a protection against dearth, and forgets to mention improved roads, and free-trade between provinces, as the really efficacious causes. But putting such objections aside, what has this actual or prospective diminution of risks to do with insurance? M. de Girardin's reasoning is as though a writer professing to treat of fire-insurance were to employ himself in pointing out how greatly risks had diminished, and how much more they might be diminished hereafter. This would be to put a small branch of the subject in the place of the whole.

But M. de Girardin takes another point of view. He says that we ought to engrave in the reason and memory of a child, that if he commits robbery or murder, it is a thousand to one against his escaping with impunity. Murders, no doubt, are generally discovered; but if it is intended to assert that out of a thousand acts of thievery, only one escapes punishment, I can only wish that this were not a gross exaggeration. If the meaning is merely that an habitual thief or murderer does not

escape punishment, but that it is a thousand to one that he will be caught sooner or later, I reply that we do already take what pains we can to make people believe this; and that we go much further than this by condemning all frauds, in the popular proverb, that honesty is the best policy.

But then it is added, that moral conduct is the interest of all; because if a man could kill with impunity, he is subject to become an unavenged victim: that if he could rob with impunity, others might rob him and escape punishment. All these remarks seem to me to be sad platitudes; and M. de Girardin appears to me to have mixed with the world to singularly little purpose, if he imagines that criminals will be deterred from exercising their trade, by the possibility that some time or other they may become victims. Cure the criminal class by wire-drawn arguments! Make "revolutions with rose-water!"

M. de Girardin, as we have seen, denies the existence of a standard of right and wrong. But, he says, it cannot be denied that those things which we call wrong are, in fact, risks. It may be disputed whether war and conquest are wrong, but it cannot be disputed that they are risks. In dissertations on morals he would substitute *risk* in the place of *wrong*. He is a believer in the selfish system of morals, and would persuade men to do right by showing them that it is their interest to do it.

All this is very trite and rather dull, except that there is a liveliness of style and an audacity of assertion

that keep our attention alive. But even if all morals may be reduced to a calculation of risks, it does not follow that these risks are capable of being insured against. A company cannot insure me against the hazards of an ill-humoured wife, or a consumptive child, or a morbid temper. It can merely replace any money losses that I may sustain by certain accidents. Nor are we told in this chapter, how we may be insured against all those moral evils, which the author is pleased to call risks and nothing else. The title is at variance with the contents. This chapter concludes with a proof of the author's learning, by a quotation of the opinions of Bias 2,400 years ago. Bias inquired :

“ If there is a Creator.

“ If this divine Creator is the sovereign judge.

“ If the immateriality of the soul can be demonstrated.

“ If moral good and ill are not relative from one individual to another, from nation to nation, from age to age.

“ If moral good and ill are absolute ; *i. e.* independent of education, of time, and space.

“ If they have an eternal sanction.

“ If this sanction is the link which attaches one life to another, like the rings of an endless chain.”

UNIVERSAL PACIFICATION.

SECTION III.—War should be insured against—This scheme is really one of defensive alliance—Not a scheme of insurance at all.

“ War is a risk.

“ This risk does not exist of itself, like that of shipwreck or fire ; it exists only because man has created it.

“ It is equivalent, on an average, to three-tenths of the ordinary expenses of States.

“ What can be done to banish or extinguish it?

“ The simplest thing possible : to insure ourselves against it.”

Now, surely, we must be arriving at the meaning of the last chapter. It often happens that we learn more of the intention of an author in a particular chapter, by a casual expression in another part of the work, than we do by reading the chapter itself. The reflected light is stronger than the direct light. War, then, is a risk, and we may protect ourselves against it very easily by insurance. But how? Insurance, as we have seen, is the removal of a money loss from the shoulders of one person, and the distribution of it on the shoulders of a great many persons. At present the loss of a war falls on the two belligerents. Can a number of nations be found who will be ready to take a share of the loss, on condition that their losses shall be similarly shared?

M. de Girardin does not pretend to find for us these nations, who will combine to share the pecuniary losses of war. His curative is of quite a different sort. If I

understand him aright, he regards Russia as the bully of Europe, and he holds that other powers ought to ally themselves to protect each other against the czar. He says that if France stands alone, the immense army she must maintain to protect her against Russia, is ruinous to her resources. But if she can induce England to join her, the reduction of expense is considerable; and if she can get Belgium, Holland, Prussia, Austria, Spain, &c., to give in their adhesion to the scheme, the expense to each contracting party will be very small. But is there anything new in this proposition? anything on which the author has reason to plume himself? What is the scheme but a defensive alliance against Russia? Just as England, Holland, Bavaria, the Elector of Brandenburg, and the House of Hapsburg, allied themselves against Louis XIV., or just as England, Russia, Austria, Prussia, Spain and Portugal, allied themselves against France under Napoleon, so, according to our author, ought the powers of Europe to ally themselves against Russia under Nicholas. But why call this an insurance? Why not express it under the good old name of a defensive alliance?

But our author goes a step further, and expresses a hope that Russia herself may see at last, that she could employ her resources to greater advantage than in aggression; that to produce and consume is better than to fight. When that time has arrived war may be at an end. "War, then, is a risk; which, after having already become more and more rare, tends to become

less and less probable, and finally to become null, as it ought long ago. Permanent peace succeeds to intermittent war; the unity of the old continent, destroyed by war, is re-established by peace."

Universal pacification then, is to arise from an abandonment by monarchs and nations, of schemes of conquest; and by an abstinence from international quarrels arising from wounded dignity, from hereditary hatreds, from commercial rivalries, from jealousy of liberty. There is no plan here for insurance. It needed no ghost from the dead, no Girardin from Brussels, to tell us this.

UNIVERSAL INSCRIPTION.

SECTION IV—Old ideas in new words—Example of verbiage—The scheme is that every one should be registered in his parish each year—Not only age but state of private accounts and of the national accounts—would give a certainty to statistics—The method a very expensive one—Infringement of individual liberty

If all the chapters of this work were filled with ideas as trite, or ill combined, as those I have brought forward, it would hardly seem worth while to pursue my task any further. We might be disposed to believe that M. de Girardin, an old periodical writer, had so long been under the necessity of expressing current ideas in a new form of words, that he had at last imposed upon himself, and had come to the point of mistaking his counters for money. But this section

furnishes the promise of something new. I will quote the opening pages as giving a fair sample of the peculiar style of the work: premising that I find it impossible to do justice in a translation to one who studies words more than things, and style more than matter.

“Universal Inscription assigns to every man his place, to every thing its value, to every cipher its rank; it is the science of mathematics applied to the study of politics with the same certainty which it has with regard to the study of astronomy.

“Universal Inscription is statistics verified; statistics verified are the wandering social order which has at last found axis and orbit; it is the reign of conjectures at an end; it is the empire of probabilities which begins; it is the caprice of passion, obeying, and no longer commanding; it is the law of calculation commanding and no longer obeying; it is the arbitrary destroyed by the absolute; it is power converted into knowledge; it is the ancient era at its close; the era of rivalries and wars, of parties and revolutions; it is the new era at its opening; the era of unity and peace, of emulation among all nations, and of civilization under every zone.

“Universal Inscription is an account opened with every child born in a commune, it is the great book of the population of every State, a book in which every man has his page, which is called INSCRIPTION OF LIFE.

“It is the new heraldry of the nineteenth century succeeding to the old heraldry of the twelfth century.

"It is the old penal régime condemned by its own impotence, radically reformed, happily destroyed.

"It is crime chastised by itself.

"It is destitution questioned and dried up by taxes.

"It is taxes transformed into insurance.

"It is providence constituted by frugality.

"It is individual frugality carried to the highest pitch by collective frugality.

"It is the State lending and no longer borrowing, fertilizing everything, ripening everything, enlightening everything, and no longer meddling in anything.

"It is the light of day succeeding to the shades of night, shades which multiply vice and crime, lies and fraud, dilapidation and destitution, depravity and hypocrisy, every excess and every degradation.

"Universal Inscription is individual inscription multiplied as many times as the commune counts matriculated inhabitants, as the state counts organised communes, as the globe counts civilised states."

Words! words! words! were readers of anything above the rank of a journal ever before so bethumped with words? Universal inscription is a political elixir, a panacea, a cure for all the ills of humanity. By means of it we might surely dispense with universal insurance, and pacification, and suffrage: for all these would inevitably follow of themselves if half what is said be true.

But after all, what in plain language is this universal inscription? Every commune, or as we should say, every parish, is to have a great ledger, in which is

to be an account opened with every individual living within its boundaries. This account is to consist of four pages of the size of a passport. "The first page is to contain the name, the number of matriculation, and all details relative to the conditions of general and special insurance." Remembering the marvellously loose way in which this word insurance has already been used, I decline to give any opinion as to what is meant by the phrase I have quoted. "The second page, the *individual account book*, comprises his declaration of assets and liabilities certified as to exactness." I presume that it is intended for this scheme to be compulsory on all. It is a strange project this of requiring a man to enter in a public book the state of his affairs. Among us, a man who wants to open a discount account with the Bank of England must declare what is the value of his property, after deducting liabilities from assets. But the applying for such an account is purely voluntary, and it is not one person in ten thousand who makes the application. Under the universal inscription, every man, whatever his vocation, would be required to do this. Under our income-tax law, every one of the middle and upper classes, who is engaged in trade or profession, must make a return of his income. This is felt to be a scarcely tolerable hardship, though any one who pleases may make a private return, and though in no case is there any entry in a public register. If every man were called on to declare the amount of his principal, and if this declaration were

entered in a public register, we might almost look for a rebellion.

But the third page of this inscription, the *national account book*, presents the annual budget of the expenses and receipts of the State. It is hard to see why this national account ought to be repeated in every case, and why one such account at the beginning of the ledger should not be sufficient. Perhaps it is intended that these accounts should be in duplicate; one copy for the authorities, one for the person interested. I suppose we must understand it to be so, because we are told that the inscription will be a substitute for the registry of birth, the passport, the voting card, and the *livret*, or workman's character. It is intended that there should be a new inscription every year, and apparently it is always to be made at the place of birth: a troublesome project for a poor man living hundreds of miles from his native commune.

The great recommendations of this plan in the eyes of its author, are that it would dispense with other registers: secondly, and principally, that it would give to statistics a certainty that they do not at present possess. As to this latter, I should suppose that the importance of perfect precision is not very great. M. de Girardin asserts that some towns have an interest in exaggerating their population, and that others have an equal interest in depreciating theirs: and he declares that such exaggerations and such depreciations do actually take place. I have never heard a suspicion expressed that such falsifications

occur in Great Britain, and surely they may be prevented everywhere from assuming any formidable dimensions. To construct a great national measure like this, in order to correct inaccuracies in a census, seems like employing a steam-hammer to drive a ten-penny nail.

We have already seen that the inscription blends the register of marriages, births, and deaths, with the passport system. It also seems calculated to effect what we do by our law of settlement. The difference is that we do not call on a man to do anything in the way of annual registry, but when he applies for parish relief, then we require to know his place of birth, or of subsequent settlement. Sometimes there arise expensive litigations between parishes, but the expenses of these are nothing as compared with what would be the cost of an annual registry of every person living. Could a duplicate register of four pages be made for a less expense than five shillings, including loss of time to the applicant, and postages? If you say that a family of five persons could have the thing done for five shillings, the six or seven millions of French families would cost a million and a quarter sterling a year.

M. de Girardin himself anticipates another objection, that derived from the infringement of individual liberty. To this he replies, "No, it would not be the destruction of all liberty, it would be the destruction of all obscurity. The worthy man who had no blot to hide would preserve his liberty; not only would he preserve it entire, but he would soon find an increase of

it; the ill doer alone would lose a large part of his. But how long has base coin had a right to complain of the perfection of genuine coin and of the consequent difficulty and hazard of counterfeiting it? Order is not repression, it is order: but for order to exist in a society, it must first be established. But social order will not be solidly founded until it rests on universal inscription."

It is worth while no doubt, to sacrifice a portion of liberty in order to attain a great end. We do this every day; and we do not scruple to give up many of the rights over our own property, in order that works of public utility may be established; nor do we complain that the State should interfere between us and our children, as in the case of compelling us to vaccinate them, to protect the public from disease. Now if any great good could be attained by universal inscription, we might bear with the evil of some infringement of liberty. If M. de Girardin proposed this scheme as a means of relieving the grievous destitution that exists in France, I should look favourably at his intentions. The English poor-law is one of the greatest differences between the condition of the French peasantry and of ours. But French authors have not courage to look the matter fairly in the face. M. Le Play indeed, is an exception, but Louis Blanc and other socialists and communists can find no better name for our system than that of a gigantic folly. It was the practice among our political economists till lately to abuse our parish system of relief: the French

writers of the revolutionary period had previously set them the example. The abuses of former days were not sufficiently distinguished from the good accomplished; and twenty years of efficient administration have not yet enlightened the holders of the old theory. It is a remark of Burke's, that in political opinions he always found the world half a century behind hand. Standing armies were a bugbear, fifty years after they ceased to be dangerous. So it is that another generation must pass away before the old cry against poor-laws will cease to be heard. If M. de Girardin's universal inscription had been proposed as a means of establishing a law of settlement, and parish, or communistic, relief, he would have entitled himself to the gratitude of his country.

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE.

SECTION V.—Minorities ought to be represented—Is M. de Girardin the author of this maxim?—Lord John Russell's application—M. de Girardin's plan—A state-mayor and a commission of control—Revolution said to be impossible—The state-mayor re-eligible—Comparison with President of United States—The state mayor's extensive functions—No division of powers—No self-government—Wages to be regulated by the Government.

I will open this section with the brilliant journalist's own words: "The right of voting being to the right of the eldest, what election is to hereditary right, what a republic is to a monarchy, what the future is to the

past, what the arctic pole is to the antarctic—to seek and find :

“The mode of universal suffrage which shall be the most certain method of choosing the best and ablest ;

“The form of State administration which, conciliating the traditions of the past with the necessities of the future, the power of initiating with efficiency of control, unity with responsibility, national greatness with public economy, *individual power* with *power indivisible* and therefore undivided, supposes order with liberty.” Such was the problem that 1848 ought to have solved or tried to solve. “But who thought of this? No one. It was precisely because I saw that no one thought of it, that I felt constrained to make it the object of most persevering research and perpetual meditation, if only to give a useful example and a wholesome impulse.”

I do not propose to follow the author through the verbiage of this any more than of the other chapters. I will content myself with noticing a few points that have struck me.

First. Minorities ought to be represented. I am not well enough acquainted with French political authors, to be able to say whether M. de Girardin is entitled to the credit of originating this opinion. He is not at all scrupulous in telling us what is his own and what he has borrowed, and he makes no pretension to precision on that point. He says in his preface : “Of all pater-nities, that of ideas is the most doubtful, consequently that which it is the least allowable to claim. Who has

conceived an idea? Never is that well known. . . . Whenever an idea appears to me good and mature, I make no scruple of assimilating it; just as I make no scruple of opening my eyes to the light of day, or my lungs to the air which they require." This is hard doctrine for inventors, for men like Beccaria or Bentham.

One consequence of this unacknowledged pilfering is that we cannot give M. de Girardin credit for any originality except where he distinctly claims it. I feel the more interested in the present instance, that of the rights of minorities, because, as it will be remembered, Lord John Russell propounded this doctrine in the House of Commons in the new measure of reform that he proposed a few years ago. In England, as far as I know, it was then new. The rights of majorities have long been well understood among us, and their duties also. The right of minorities to forbearance and tolerance have been realised and carried into practice; and since minorities have not been oppressed, they have been contented to waive all claim to power. Minorities have in France been less resigned, perhaps because majorities have been less considerate. I have heard a very intelligent Frenchman justify the rebellion of minorities, on the ground that new truths are always in a minority; forgetting that though truth is often in a minority, a minority does not always possess truth. Lord John Russell's proposition, that wherever it is possible, a town or district should have three members, and that each elector should possess only two votes, seems on the

face of it fair enough: and if it did not stir up any enthusiasm among the older liberal thinkers, it was because such men are now unwilling to disturb the balance of a constitution that works smoothly and well, and because they have learned to distrust all new measures. Further debate and more matured reflection might perhaps make the proposition acceptable.

M. de Girardin's scheme is a more serious one, as it has reference to the whole organization of power. He proposes that the entire people having voted for twelve candidates, the one who receives the highest number of votes shall be the head of the Government, and shall be called State Mayor. The eleven candidates who stand highest on the list after the State Mayor, are to form a council, which is to be called, *the national commission of superintendence and publicity*. Here, he says, you have one name representing the compact majority: eleven names representing the divided minority. Such a plan might find acceptance in France where everything is in a transition state, and where a new constitution is no more surprising than a new railroad. But in England, where we have a form of government, not traced on paper, but written in the habits and hearts of the people, the very hint of a new kind of monarch and a new kind of council, is distasteful to all. We wonder at the folly of the French, who after the experience of nearly three-quarters of a century, are still bent on constructing constitutions.

I will notice a few points in this wonderful plan. Each elector has only one vote, so that the suffrages

given will be precisely the number of electors who exercise their right. It is not improbable that the Mayor and the Council would sometimes disagree: in that case there would be an appeal to the people. The following gratifying results would follow; and follow, according to M. de Girardin, not probably, but with certainty.

“Usurpations, conflicts, insurrections, revolutions, would be physically impossible in this system; I may say then that it abolishes them.

“For the war of parties it substitutes liberty of opinions.

“There are neither conquerors nor vanquished. There is a distribution of functions between them. The one party has the administration, the other has control.

“The force of minorities which has long been lost and dangerous, becomes valuable and turned to account.

“This system combines the respective advantages of monarchy and democracy, for it conciliates stability with activity.

“Proofs:

“If the people, if the sovereign, is satisfied with its mayor, it re-elects him every year, and retains him until his death:—Stability. If on the contrary, the sovereign finds that its mayor becomes remiss, it changes him; and to find a successor, it has only to choose either elsewhere, or from among the eleven members of the council the one who has exhibited the most vigilance, firmness, and ability:—Activity.”

We are told that revolution would be impossible. It is scarcely competent perhaps for an Englishman to judge of the truth of this assertion, as no living Englishman has had any personal experience of what revolution is. But if a looker-on sees most of the game, I would suggest, as a looker-on, that if ill feeling sprung up between the mayor and the council; a circumstance that seems probable enough; the mayor, if he were a Napoleon, would be likely enough to cut the controversy short by a *coup d'état*. Nor is any reason assigned why this fatal accident might not as well happen under this patent duplex constitution, warranted never to be out of order, as under the organization of representative chamber and president. M. de Girardin's warranty will hardly be deemed sufficient.

Then; the mayor is to be elected for a year and is to be reëligible. In the United States, the mayor (or President) is chosen for a short term of years, and is reëligible. How does the scheme work? Abominably. Most men are bent on retaining any power they may possess. If a politician is ambitious and unscrupulous, he avows that he wants to keep office: if he is ambitious and scrupulous, he shelters himself under the plea of usefulness. But in whatever character, and under whatever plea, the American President generally has his eyes open to the possibility of reëlection: and mischievous are the consequences. During the first term of office, this American Mayor of State, anxious to ingratiate himself with the sovereign people, who can

reëlect or reject him, lends himself to every fanatical cry, fans the flame of international animosities, and trimming his sails to catch the popular breeze, becomes the President of a party instead of the President of a nation. These well known facts, M. de Girardin is either ignorant of or overlooks. He should have told us in what way his proposed Mayor would be protected from such evil influences.

But what would an English reader suppose to be the functions of this elective Mayor; of this sovereign, the annual creature of the people? He might conjecture that those functions would be limited: certainly not greater than those of an American President; perhaps not greater than those of an English monarch. Such a guess would be far wide of the mark. The State Mayor is to possess all the direct power of the State, not only executive, but also legislative. There is to be no Parliament, no Congress, no Chamber of Deputies, but only a Mayor, with a Council of Control. M. de Girardin is of opinion that the legislative and the executive powers ought to reside in the same hands. To prove this he quotes MM. Proudhon and Littré, the one a politician of whom we know something; the other a member of the Institute. M. Proudhon says:

“The division of powers is a remainder of what we call politics, which is nothing but the eternal deception of liberty. It is the sundering of what is most radically indivisible; of that whose division implies a contradiction, the *will* of the sovereign. In society, as in man, the functions are various but the will is essentially

one." Such pseudo-philosophy would scarcely convince a jury of Englishmen.

M. Littré says: "It is by a vicious imitation of the English régime that the Chamber of Deputies interposes in the creation of laws. *Law is essentially an act of sovereign power.* But in the English régime, in which there are so many remains of feudal aristocracy, the central power has not acquired the effective preponderance which it has obtained in our country, formed under the energetically centralizing action of monarchy and revolution. Besides, this power has been forcibly dismembered, and a part of its functions has remained in the hands of provincial authority. When the English régime was imported among us, all was taken in the gross; and the French deputies, like the members of the English Parliament, have found themselves invested with the power of making laws."

It appears then, that M. de Girardin has no wish to see the French representative body restored: that he is quite in favour of a constitution in which the head of the State, the temporary monarch, has power to abrogate any law however sacred, and to enact any law however vile. No doubt, the State Mayor would do anything extravagant at an imminent risk of censure and punishment. The commission of control would, as soon as the mischief was done, proceed to appeal to the people against it. But suppose a case in which the Mayor was bent on securing his own reelection, at whatever cost. Imagine that the ancient hostility to the English had been awakened by some alleged infringement of

maritime rights, or some ill-founded colonial claims. The Mayor, pandering to the electors, to secure their annual votes, passes a law, of his own authority, that no Englishman shall be allowed to remain in France more than fourteen days at a time: or that no Englishman shall be employed in France. In vain would the Council appeal to the people. In short, any Mayor, by identifying himself with the people, might set the Council at defiance, and might retain power in despite of it.

It is quite unnecessary to dwell on the loss that would arise in such a Government, from the cessation of popular discussions. It may be true that in our houses of Parliament, the speeches delivered do not to any considerable extent influence the votes given at the time. The orations must be regarded as an assignment of the reasons why a certain vote is about to be given, rather than as an attempt to secure the coöperation of other members. But, as has often been pointed out, the necessity of delivering a speech, compels men to examine the grounds of their own opinions, and reacts very powerfully upon themselves. Then, the effect produced by the debates upon the country at large, is very great. Thousands of persons in every locality, peruse the reasons assigned by the legislators; and the nation is kept in harmony with the Government, without exercising a hasty and predominant influence over it.

We see however, by the quotations I have given, that M. de Girardin is not a favourer of self-government; but that he thinks the centralized administration of

France, superior to the divided powers of England. It is amazing that after all which has been written on this topic, able men should be found to profess an admiration of centralization. Happily, among ourselves, the practice of local authority is so engrained in our habits, that there is no danger of our becoming converts to the degrading doctrine, that the people cannot to a great extent govern themselves.

These notions may be summed up in this sentence. "There is no longer a government of one man by another: there is only an administration of public affairs by one, under the control of all."

I do not propose to follow all the opinions propounded in this chapter. But I must point out that if M. de Girardin is favourable to giving all power, legislative as well as executive, to one man, it is not because he regards that power as of small importance. He thoroughly shares, on the contrary, the French mania for doing by Government interference, what we prefer to do by individual or local exertions. Thus as to wages, he says as follows:—

"Bearing in mind that it has been acknowledged that the insufficiency of wages is one of the most general causes of indigence among able-bodied men;

"That it is indisputable that the remuneration of labour is left to chance or violence;

"That the low rate of wages is one of the greatest vices of the old world; that we cannot regard as happy, a society in which by the smallness and the influence of wages, the workmen have a maintenance so limited,

that being barely able to satisfy their first necessities, they have neither the means of marrying nor of bringing up a family, and are reduced to mendicity whenever employment is wanting, or age and sickness incapacitate them for labour; that low wages constitute one cause for the ruin of a manufacture, as high wages are a cause of prosperity," &c., &c.

"In consequence of the above, the following decree is made:—

" FIRST ARTICLE.

"In no case, for whatever work or in whatever trade, shall the legal rate of wages be below what is necessary for the purchase of:—

Bread	.	.	000 kilogr. at 00 c.	.	000
Meat	.	.	000 „ „	.	000
Wine, beer or cider	000 litres	„	.	00	
Vegetables, butter, milk, eggs, groceries	.			00	
House rent	00
Fuel	00
Light	00
Dress	00
Washing	00
Sundries	00
General assurance	.	(taxes)	.	00	
Pension	.	.	(old age)	.	00
Common corporation bank (want of work)				00	
Special wages-bank	.	(sickness)	.	00	
Total					000

Instead of returning to the old plan of regulating wages by law, you had better restore the Bastille at once!

But not content with regulating the rate of wages, M. de Girardin would interfere in an arbitrary manner with the occupation of women. He cites England as having forbidden the employment of women in mines. But he would go much further than this. He would forbid the employment of women in shops, forges, workshops and manufactures. Now it cannot be disputed that it is a great evil for married women to leave their families and go into factories during the day. But the same objection does not apply to unmarried women; and it is very important that these should have the means of living within their reach. As to morals, there is no more injury done to a young woman by working in a moderately well-regulated factory, than in working anywhere else. We are often shocked when we hear that certain language has been used in the presence of women or children at work; but we cannot forget that the very same language is used at home or within hearing by neighbours.

Even as to married women, there are cases in which the opportunity of maintaining themselves and their families is of essential service. A husband dies. If the widow can earn twelve to twenty shillings a week in a factory, that is far better than that she should go to the workhouse, or starve on private charity. If she becomes an inmate of the union, she must be separated from her children; but if she goes to a factory, she sees them at

meal times, and she is with them at night and during Sunday. Or if a husband deserts his wife, or enlists as a soldier, the resource of the factory is a great mitigation of the evil. M. de Girardin proposes the same prohibition as to children under fifteen years old. In both cases he shows an ignorance of the practical question, and is no doubt unaware that such a law as he desires, would condemn hundreds of thousands of women and children to starvation. It is very well to say that the scarcity of labour, after this law had come into operation, would raise the rate of wages, and would enable a married man to get as much for his own labour alone, as he now gets for his own, with that of his wife and children. This would be very advantageous for him. But it would be no consolation for the widow, or the deserted wife, or the unmarried girl, or the children without a father. M. de Girardin's benevolence costs him little and is of a very speculative sort.

UNIVERSAL JUSTICE.

SECTION VI.—Courts are no longer to inflict any punishment, because justice is fallible—Practice tried by examples.

The notions propounded under this head are so singular, that I will quote the very words, lest I should be suspected of misrepresentation.

“Human justice, which holds in her hands a balance and a sword, should no longer hold anything but a balance.

“She ought to weigh but to strike no more. Infallibility alone possesses this supreme right. But human justice, which has condemned Jesus to die crucified—can she persuade herself and others that she is infallible? Did not human justice, on that day, sign the condemnation for ever of penal justice?”

“To verify a fact, even without the necessity of declaring it a crime or a misdemeanour, this punishes the guilty; for it exposes him, in proportion to the indulgence or rigour of the age and country, to blame, contempt, or execration. Punishment ought not to go further or stop short of this. Then the proof of a crime is the chastisement of the crime, the criminal is his own executioner. The magistrate receives the conflicting evidence and weighs it; as soon as he has weighed it his duty is finished, his work is at an end; he has verified the fact, he has not condemned the man. Man is no longer judged by man; man has no longer any judge but his conscience, his country, and his age. If a misdeed has been falsely imputed to him, if the witnesses have lied, if the magistrate is deceived, truth is there to preserve all his rights, and justice has nothing to fear; for then truth which shows itself is to justice which reconsiders its verdict, what the decision of a court of appeal is to that of the inferior court.”

All this reasoning seems to me superficial and flimsy. If it were directed against the practice of capital punishment, I could respect it though I failed to be convinced by it. The fallibility of judgment is a strong argu-

ment against putting a man to death; since, if the man's innocence afterwards comes out, no compensation can possibly be made. But M. de Girardin attacks all punishment on this ground. A court of justice is fallible: therefore it should never punish any one. Tawell is tried for murdering in cold blood a friendless woman whose only fault was that she had loved him. The court assembles, the witnesses are heard, Sir Fitzroy Kelly tries to shift the blame from the Quaker accused to some innocent apple-pippins, the judge sums up, the jury pronounce the accused guilty of murder. That is all. The dock is opened, the convicted assassin walks away, and if he escape Lynch law, returns home to the enjoyment of his wealth. No doubt he would have to seek some other country as a place of abode; but as all other murderers would be equally at large, there would be an amiable fraternity ready to embrace him.

But there is moreover, a gross inconsistency in M. de Girardin's statement. He says, human justice is fallible, therefore it ought not to punish.

"No more scaffolds and capital inflictions.

"No more forced labours, whether for life or for shorter periods.

"No more transportation.

"No more arrests, seclusion, or imprisonment."

A man is caught in the fact of stealing a handkerchief: you must not sentence him to a month's imprisonment, because justice is fallible. A ruffian is caught in a dwelling-house into which he has broken: you must not sentence him to penal servitude, because

justice is fallible. A blackguard amuses himself with kicking his wife to death, and the cries of the victim cause the brute to be caught in the offence: you must not think of punishing him, because justice is fallible. Then why try the man? Why have courts of justice at all? Oh! it is important that the facts should be verified, in order that society may itself punish the offender, "according to the indulgence or rigour of the age and country, by blame, contempt, or execration." Are then, blame, contempt, and execration, punishments? To some men certainly very severe ones. But if justice is so fallible that it ought not to inflict a month's imprisonment on a pickpocket caught in the fact, how can it be right for the same fallible justice to condemn other offenders to the blame, contempt, or execration that will certainly follow the verdict of guilty? What is the difference, whether justice inflict the punishment herself, or do that which will certainly lead to the infliction by others? This is the hypocrisy of the persecuting days, when the Church would by no means put a heretic to death; but merely handed him over to the secular arm, with a hope expressed that he would be dealt with tenderly, and a certain expectation that he would burn at the stake.

M. de Girardin is an admirable legislator. He would abolish imprisonment, flogging, transportation, hanging: the punishments feared by the desperate ruffian, who glories in his crimes and cares nothing for blame and execration: he would retain those punishments which

are feared by the decent classes of society among whom crime is rare. Where punishment is most needed he does away with it : where it might be dispensed with, and no great damage would ensue, he carefully retains it.

If we look at this abolition of punishment as it would act in ordinary life, we shall find marvellous inconveniences. A master summons his apprentice for leaving his service. He states that he has taught the youth his trade during five years, and that now in the sixth year, when a profit ought to be made to the master, the apprentice has gone to work for some one else. The magistrate listens, questions the youth, and ascertains that the facts really are as they have been represented. He then delivers himself of a judgment. "You, Thomas Jones, have been guilty of a fraud upon your master. You have learnt your trade from him, under a promise to work for him until you are of age. By working on your own account for another master, you are refusing to pay a just debt. Will you now promise to go back and work out your time?"—"No, sir, I will not. I think it a hard case that I should not work for myself. I want to get married."—"Then, Thomas Jones, I regard you as a dishonest person; and I trust that your companions will visit you with blame or execration as seems to them right." Thomas Jones leaves the dock, and grinning at the magistrate and the master, rejoins his companions who carry him off in triumph, and regard him as a hero. But the master, finding that punishment has been abolished, waylays the apprentice and beats him soundly. Being

summoned for this offence, he avows it, and the magistrate declaring him guilty, leaves him to the blame or execration of his brother masters, who give him a dinner to celebrate his spirited conduct. Abolish legal punishment and you restore Lynch law.

I am almost ashamed of having argued at any length, against such a monstrous proposition: but M. de Girardin's eminence must be my excuse. I would suggest that in another edition of the work, the title of this chapter should be changed, and that instead of being headed Universal Justice, it should be headed *Universal Injustice*.

UNIVERSAL DOWRY.

Liberty in marriage, by equality of children with respect to their mother.

SECTION VII.—Statistics of illegitimacy—Said to be increasing—Is this true?—All children to be equal as regards their mother, and to belong altogether to their mother—Marriage is no longer to be sanctioned by the State—Every woman is to demand a dowry before cohabitation—Money difficulty—Objections met.

The author tells us that this chapter is only an abridgment of a work published by him on the same subject; and he adds that the original treatise extends to 428 pages. For those who have little sympathy with extravagances on such momentous subjects as marriage, but who are desirous of knowing what recent doctrines have been put forth, this abridgment is a mercy. Forty pages of absurdities are quite enough for squeamish stomachs.

The introduction is the strongest part of the chapter. It repeats the statistics of illegitimacy. It tells us that in Paris more than a third of the children are born out of wedlock, while in the whole of France rather more than a thirteenth only are so unfortunate; and that therefore seventy thousand of French infants are born irregularly each year: giving a total of not very far from three millions of illegitimates living at one time. A number of other particulars are given as to various countries; and an attempt is made to show that the evil is on the increase.

M. de Girardin states two causes for the augmentation of illegitimacy; the development of manufactures, and the growth of towns. This is a mere adoption of a popular opinion, without any attempt to verify it. If it were true, we should find the greatest number of illegitimate births, in great manufacturing countries and in countries possessing an unusual number of towns. As to the first we should at once name England and Belgium. Now we learn from our Registrar General's sixth report, page 23, that at the date of that report England (excluding Scotland and agricultural Ireland) and Belgium were both of them rather superior to France and Prussia, and very superior to Denmark, Hanover, and Bavaria. As to the second assertion, that the multiplication of towns vitiates the births, that may be true of France, Austria, and Belgium; but it is not true of England, since there are actually fewer bastards born in English towns than in English rural districts. Besides this, if towns were necessarily so

unfavourable to morality, we should find the greatest amount of vice in England where towns are far more numerous in proportion than they are elsewhere. Since the declaration of American independence, the three great commercial towns, Liverpool, Manchester, and Birmingham, have advanced from one hundred thousand to eleven times that amount. Other places have multiplied exceedingly. Yet in spite of this development of towns and of the manufacturing system, England is rather more moral than France and Prussia, and very little inferior to Norway and Sweden.

The actual returns I have alluded to give the illegitimate births,—

Sweden and Norway	.	.	6½ per cent.
England and Belgium	.	.	6¼ „
France and Prussia	.	.	7 „
Denmark and Hanover	.	.	9 „
Austria and Wurtemberg	.	.	11 „
Saxony	.	.	14 „
Bavaria	.	.	20 „

It does not appear, then, that M. de Girardin, in quoting the popular opinion against the authorities, and in failing to adduce any confirmatory evidence, has exhibited a profound knowledge of the subject. At the same time he puts in a striking point of view the fact, that there are in France two to three millions of men, women, and children, whose birth has been stained by the vice of their parents. It may be said with some truth that these people form “a nation

within a nation." From these outcasts, no doubt, are largely recruited, the workhouse, the brothel, and the gaol.

If we could reduce the vice which leads to these injurious results, we should accomplish a great work for the happiness of the world. It is proposed, however, in this chapter, that we should deal with the mischief in a different way; and there is a song of triumph at the discovery of a simple idea which is to set the world free at once from this crying evil. *Children are all to be equal with regard to their mother.*

"This principle being embodied in a law, all distinction disappears between children reputed legitimate and those reputed illegitimate.

"All alike bear the name of the mother.

"All alike inherit her property.

"All have the same rights to the same care, the same anxiety.

"Two millions eight hundred thousand French people, banished from common rights, regain them, if not at present, yet hereafter.

"The principle of civil equality, a relative truth, advances a step towards an absolute truth.

"There are no longer two nations in one; a little one included in a greater; the former thrust by the latter out of the pale of common law and natural right. National homogeneity, which did not exist, is now established.

"Woman, whose part in society had been corrupted, recovers her rights.

"Social order has certainty, instead of probability, for a foundation. .

"I am aware of the outcry that will arise; and that I shall be told: to make maternity instead of paternity the basis of social order, is to overthrow social order.

"I reply: it is a factitious order overthrown, a natural order replaced.

"A rejoinder is made: if such were in fact the true basis of social order, it would not have required five thousand years," &c. I stop at this point because this jargon about new discoveries is really too trite.

The proposed changes, then, are altogether revolutionary. Children are no longer to take the name of their father, they are not to be heirs to his property, and they have no reason for inquiring curiously who actually is their father. The entire alterations in the constitution of society, that would result from this new system, are so numerous and great that the mind is perplexed in trying to apprehend them: and it is really startling to find a man of a certain age and of much worldly experience, speaking with as much confidence of the effects that would follow, as if he were merely announcing the discovery of a new metal, or the invention of an improved steam-engine. Society is not to be reconstructed by such socialism as this. It may be true indeed that many simple ideas are late in being discovered: but there is a great gap between this truth and the other proposition, that simple ideas are generally true. M. de Girardin says there is no God: the statement is simple but not true. M. Proudhon

says that all property is a robbery: the assertion is abundantly simple, and utterly false.

But what is the real intention in this wild scheme? Is it to get rid of bastards by making all bastards? Is it to get rid of the binding character of marriage? This last consequence is at any rate proposed as important. "The first of these consequences, I hasten to avow it, is to strike out the celebration of marriage from the number of the acts in which the State has assumed a right to interfere. . . .

"The celebration of marriage ought always to have been an act purely and exclusively religious.

"Marriage is an act of faith not of law. It is for faith to govern it, not for law to regulate it.

"As soon as law interposes, it does so without right, without necessity, without utility."

If this means anything, it means that there ought to be an end of marriage as a part of social organization. Men and women may live together as long a time or as short a time as they please; and no religious vows that have passed between them, with whatever solemnity, are to be recognized in any way by the Government.

As I understand this scheme, the civil contract of marriage is abandoned, but if people choose to use a religious ceremony the law connives at the proceeding. All that M. de Girardin desires is, that a woman before she cohabits with a man, (I cannot use the word marry) should require a dowry, which is to become her own property, and is to be managed solely by herself. This dowry she is to require, not for her own benefit, but for

that of the child who may probably result from the cohabitation. Now one difficulty presents itself at the threshold. Women have not the gift of prophecy, and cannot predict the number of children that a family will consist of; and therefore the only way of satisfactorily arranging the agreement of cohabitation, would be that it should be binding until the birth of a child, and that then it should cease. If the man choose to make another settlement, another year's cohabitation would follow. In England there is in country places a custom of hiring servants by the year, and at the end of the hiring, servants commonly change their service. Under this French scheme, we should require statutes for wives or rather for paramours. This is a very gross and exaggerated form of the custom of handfasting. The whole plan is repugnant to the sense of feminine delicacy, which shrinks from the notion of a series of successful lovers.

In the case of a majority of mankind too, the insufficiency of the proposed dowry is obvious. If such a change took place in manners as to require a settlement in every case, what would be the possible amount? Many working men at present save little or nothing as bachelors; and if we suppose that an enforced frugality followed the change, how much could we expect them to save? Suppose a youth, besides furnishing a house, had put by 20*l*. This is the dowry he offers to the girl of his heart. Within a year a child is born, and the man not having another 20*l*. to offer, or perhaps tired of his bargain, turns the woman and child out, with 20*l*.

to maintain them. The interest of this sum is nothing as a means of support, and part of it will be required for furniture. In a short time the whole 20*l.* will have disappeared, and the young woman will be left with a child to maintain out of her own earnings. Compare this with the right which a married woman now has, to demand support by her husband for herself and her children. Compare it even with the right which in England a woman has, to an allowance of 5*l.* or 6*l.* a year for the maintenance of an illegitimate child. But the whole matter is fictitious from beginning to end. Women of decent demeanour, all women who are worthy of special protection by law, would abhor the notion of saying to a husband (if I must call him such) after the birth of a child;—now we must part: unless you can give me another 20*l.* I leave you. But for what we have seen before of this author's extravagances, we should say that he could not possibly be in earnest in this plan of his.

I shall show however, that he is thoroughly in earnest, by enumerating various objections that he states and tries to answer.

First:—"What you propose is a return to that age of transition when a man no longer stole a wife, but bought her:—answer: When a man bought a wife, who received the price? Herself? No, her parents. Was she free to refuse or accept? No, she was not even consulted," &c. &c. To most of us it would seem infinitely more offensive that a girl should sell her favours, than that her parents should sell them.

Secondly: "If it is no longer the woman who is sold, it is the woman who sells herself:—answer: No; it is not the woman who sells herself, it is the woman who foresees that she may, and may expect to be, a mother, and who stipulates, not for herself, but for her children. Where is the difference I ask you, in the case of a girl carried to the mairie and the church, who brings no fortune and receives a dowry? At any rate, the woman who sells herself and who abandons her child cannot be purer in your eyes than the woman who sells herself in order to bring up her child."

Then comes an objection that the demand for dowry would, as to the lower classes, postpone the period of cohabitation (miscalled marriage) and lead to many irregularities. It is answered that wages ought to be raised and might be raised. Further, that the rights of woman would be established by this organization.

I pass on to the fifth chapter: "What part remains to fathers? Answer:—what it is, and what the law has thought right to make it relatively to the 2,800,000 children whom it interdicts from inquiring as to paternity. If this part is simple and perfectly equitable in that case, why should it be less equitable and less simple when extended to other cases?" &c. To us in England that law seems simple enough, but very far from equitable. The new poor law, twenty-five years ago, was an approximation to the French law; but it was so revolting to the English sense of justice, that after a few years it was altered: and since that

time, the fathers of illegitimate children, when proved to be fathers by the oath of the mother corroborated by some collateral evidence, are compelled to maintain their offspring. But under all arrangements, whether those of France or those of England, these irregularly born infants are greatly to be pitied for the want of the avowed and open protection of a father: and M. de Girardin, in desiring to place all children in the same relation, seems to me to be levelling on a wrong principle, by depressing the fortunate instead of raising the unfortunate.

I cannot spare room for all the other numerous objections and the unsatisfactory answers given to them. I quote only one more sentence. "We have to choose between two régimes; that of presumed paternity, which is the régime of the law, and that of maternity, bearing its proof in itself, which is the régime of nature; the latter conformable to unquestionable truth, the former condemned by unquestioned statistics."

On the whole. if law ought to be the expression of the enlightened moral sense of mankind; if according to that sense, chastity and constancy are virtues of the highest class; if it would be shocking to us to see girls putting up a year's cohabitation to auction, and demanding as the price of constancy a new and still a new dowry, nominally indeed for the maintenance of a probable child, but really for her own benefit as well as that of her offspring; if the family is the true basis of all society, meaning by family, father, mother,

and children, and not a mother surrounded by children with a number of unavowed fathers; if all these things are true, then is M. de Girardin's scheme of cohabitation disgusting and pernicious.

THE UNIVERSAL TENTH.

SECTION VIII—A state provision for the aged and destitute by a tax on employers—Regulation of workmen's labour—The scheme examined financially—A very bad poor-law.

This chapter opens thus: "The Universal Tenth is the question of the extinction of pauperism reduced to its most simple expressions.

"To extirpate destitution everywhere and for ever, is only a question of one penny.

"In truth, to extirpate destitution for ever and everywhere, what is necessary? To levy a centime on every hour of labour, one penny a day, two francs and a half a month, twenty-five shillings a year, and during thirty years, nine hundred francs" (37*l.* 10*s.*).

What is this but a poor-law, the bugbear of French writers? These people call our poor-law a colossal folly. But why cannot M. de Girardin speak out, and say that his countrymen for a hundred years past have been mistaken, and that the English poor-law, or something equivalent to it, is wanted for the relief of destitution in France.

M. de Girardin's scheme then, is that of a poor-law, and it differs from ours principally in the mode of collecting

the tax for the purpose. His proposition is that every employer of labour should set apart a penny a day for every person in his service; and apparently, that this should not be taken out of the wages previously paid, but should be advanced by the manufacturer, or farmer, or shopkeeper, and got back again in the price of commodities. The tax would be considerable in a large manufactory; for a master employing a thousand persons would be charged twelve or fourteen hundred pounds a year. The real question is, whether there is any peculiar advantage in raising the necessary amount in this particular way. If there be any such advantage let us adopt it: but manufacturers would rebel against an arrangement, which at any rate seems to tax them while it leaves persons in other vocations to escape. If it were intended that the workmen should pay the tax, as being the persons to benefit by it, there would be much grumbling on the part of the steady, frugal, men, at having to subscribe to a fund which they would not have occasion to use. As to the notion of making this a means of supporting sick-clubs, the example of England, and latterly of France itself, show that workmen are competent to conduct those for themselves, with some guidance and regulation by Government.

I do not therefore feel any particular interest in the mode in which this fund is to be applied: and yet it is so whimsical that it is worth noting. The lives of men are to be divided into three parts, and each part is to have its own destination.

“First part; from 1 to 15 years:—Education.

“Second part; from 16 to 45 years:—Labour.

“Third part; from 46 to 60 years:—Rest.”

It is assumed that the payment of 25*s.* a year during thirty years of labour, will furnish a fund sufficient to maintain the children relieved from their present work, and to furnish them with education: and after doing this, will be large enough to maintain all the labourers who survive the age of 45 years. M. de Girardin's political arithmetic might easily be shown to be very defective here. But I will only point out one serious error.

Put the children out of the question, and suppose that the thirty years' payment, amounting to 37*l.* 10*s.*, is all to be applied to the support of men above 45. It is assumed that these persons will not live beyond 60; but 65 would be a low average. There would thus be men during thirty years of life working for men during twenty years of life: and this virtually raises the aggregate payment to 56*l.*, or nearly 3*l.* a year for the men in repose:—something more than a shilling a week. But a large addition must be made for the fact that the men living at 45 to 65 years old, are far fewer for each year than those living at 21 to 45 years old. Yet the difference is not so great as might be supposed. According to the French tables, 1,000 persons living at 21 years old are reduced at 45 years old to about 650, or about two-thirds. But if we even assume the reduction to be so much greater that the men in repose will, instead of 1*s.*, have 2*s.*, or

2s. 6d. a week, what a miserable provision is this! A state of repose and enjoyment on 2s. 6d. a week! And this is after we have struck off all allowance for children under 15. If the children were educated out of this fund, there would not be 1s. a week for the men in repose.

M. de Girardin must be singularly ignorant of the principles of population and mortality. He says that few workmen attain the age of 46 years. The reason he assigns for this opinion, is, that the mean age of the French is only 36 years. As the population of France increases slowly, I will not insist on the difference between mean age, and expectation of life (if Dr. Farr will allow me to retain an understood term). Say then, for the sake of argument, that a new born French infant's expectation of life is 36 years. But this has no bearing on our present business. The question here is, how many survivors after 45 years old, the men of 21 to 45 will have to provide for. I have already shown that of those men who attain to 21, more by far than one half reach the age of 45.

M. de Girardin's political economy is about on a par with his political arithmetic. He says; "consumption, consequently production, consequently employment, would take a rapid flight and an immense development, since it would no longer find an invincible obstacle in the well-founded fear which the labourer has of falling into destitution, a sinister alarm which stifles the consumer in the labourer." If I wanted a paradox

with which to head a chapter on consumption and production I should be here well supplied.

After all, why should it be desired to place a working man of forty-six in a state of repose? Is it imagined that people are happier in idleness? Do any of us find that days in which we have no employment, are red letter days in our calendar? A man of 46 is very often in the prime of life; and if he have lost the activity of youth, he has not lost the power of steady and continuous labour. Long after forty-five, even till sixty, aye even till seventy, mechanics are found competent to maintain themselves: and it would be a positive cruelty to put before them a temptation to idleness.

It is extraordinary that M. de Girardin did not calculate how much on the whole, would be raised by his proposed *décime*. If he had found that allowing for expenses and losses in collection and for the number of vigorous persons constantly out of work, and therefore to be excused payment, the amount to be distributed would not be greater than what we raise in this country purely for the relief of destitution; he would have seen at once that the fund proposed could not have both relieved destitution and provided education for the children and maintenance for all persons over 45 years old. Among the many monstrosities of this work, I will not say this is one of the greatest; though it shows, I think, as much ignorance of social science, as other schemes show ignorance of moral science.

SECTION IX.—M. de Girardin's recapitulation—My conclusion.

There are two other chapters, of which I do not propose to say anything. The titles of them are *Universal Property*, and *Universal Autonomy*. I will merely explain that by autonomy is meant self-government. It is confessed that the English term cannot be rendered into French; and we might remark that the French not having the thing, could dispense with the name, only that we cannot forget that in many cases a name is found where the thing it represents is very rare.

I complete this chapter by translating the recapitulation of the work.

“ 1. Universal self-government is liberty limited by reciprocity.

“ 2. Universal property is the right of conquest by labour; it is labour triumphant; it is idleness, fallen; it is property legitimised by its origin and its works.

“ 3. The universal décime is individual savings raised to its highest power by collective savings; it is destitution relieved by insufficient charity, abolished by competent wages; it is the gulf between property and luxury filled up and levelled by well-being.

“ 4. Universal dowry is the equality of children with regard to their mother; it is the end of the old world and the birth of the new world; it is man valued no longer for his ancestry, but valued exclusively for his deeds; it is hereditary title giving place to personal distinction, the privilege of birth to universality of

election, aristocracy to democracy, and an universal republic to a secular monarchy.

“5. Universal instruction is the exclusive reign of individual superiority and of voluntary obedience; it is personal authority dethroning traditional authority; it is living law succeeding to written law; it is civilization becoming everywhere the only constitution; it is immaterial force ruling over material force; it is power reduced in name and in fact to knowledge.

“6. Universal justice is justice snatched from the slavery of politics, and taking that rank to which it is entitled above politics; it is the condemnation of force under every name: wars and conquests; revolutions and dictatorships; superstition and necessities; crimes and arbitrary offences; it is mutual justice devoting to the blame, contempt, and execration, of each country and of each age, every act which has wounded the public conscience.

“7. Universal suffrage is the political world which has regained its axis and social order, which has regained its law: it is the presumptive right of capacity succeeding to the professed right of inheritance; it is, wherever there is a collective interest, the interest of the greatest number administered by the chosen of the greatest number.

“8. Universal inscription is the reciprocal control of men by things, and of things by men; it is moral order established by material order; it is durable order based on publicity in place of precarious order maintained by repression.

“9. Universal pacification is the hazard of war destroyed by mutual international assurance, and disappearing of itself as disappears an effect of which the cause has ceased; it is rivalry of produce succeeding to rivalry of territory, the art of producing taking the place of the art of destruction; it is progress carrying liberty everywhere, and liberty everywhere accelerating progress; it is the *cost of return* reduced by all the expensive maintenance of permanent armies; it is, consequently, for less labour, more well-being.

“10. Universal insurance is association with all its advantages and without the inconveniences of communism; it is the successive application of all kinds of progress to the gradual extinction of all risks; it is caprice deposed by calculation; it is the arbitrary replaced by the absolute; it is evil transformed mathematically into risks in the social as in the physical order, it is evil scrutinised and combated, not in its effects, but in its causes; it is, finally, repression, which has never invented anything beyond punishment, taking refuge in the past, and leaving the future to foresight, which has succeeded in turning the study of chances into an exact science, a science which opens the era of universal politics, a science of which the three terms will be:

Liberty, Publicity, Unity.

" Mutual liberty is common law.

" The State, an abstract and collective existence, has no right to preside over and govern anything but what is necessarily *indivisible*, consequently *undivided*, essentially *collective*, exclusively *public*.

" Nothing can be compelled to remain undivided.

" Whatever is undivided is free.

" Then:

" Speech is free.

" The press is free.

" Instruction is free.

" Association is free.

" Religious worship is free.

" Agreements are free.

" Agreements are the law of parties.

" Codes point out to the inexperience of men, formulas consecrated by the experience of ages. They indicate and do not prescribe.

" A crime or offence *committed* has for punishment, a crime or offence verified.

" Damage caused is punished by damage repaired.

" Children are equal with regard to their mother.

" The mother is responsible for the fate of her children.

" Maternity alone offering the certainty necessary to the right of succession, the State secures the right of succession only to the descending and ascending maternal line.

" The probability of risk determines the rate of premium.

“ Voluntary premium abolishes forcible taxation.

“ The payment and funding of the premium of general insurance, are the contract freely and reciprocally entered into between the sovereign Individual and the sovereign State.

“ Every functionary for whom a superior functionary is not responsible, is elected.

“ Every elected functionary is responsible for his acts, only to elective justice and universal suffrage.”

Such is the system of social organization propounded by one of the most popular authors of Paris: such the scheme written by M. de Girardin while in exile, and after the painful experience of a revolutionary period of four years. We may suppose that the habitual journalist knew well how the pulse of his countrymen beat, and would not have risked his popularity by printing anything likely to be generally condemned. The rapid sale of the book confirms this notion.

I must conclude, then, that the *Politique Universelle* proposes doctrines and projects not repugnant to Parisian ideas; and I infer that France is not yet rid of that itch for novelties, and that eagerness for quackish devices, which render a free and settled government impossible.

CHAPTER VIII.

CONCLUSION.

Recapitulation of the leading doctrines—Exploitation condemned—My defence of capitalists—Two examples; first, Belgium during the famine; second, English manufacturers during slackness of trade—Competition—Acknowledged evils—Yet a necessary stimulus—The evils may be slowly corrected—By education—By improved public opinion—Present want of moderation in pursuit of wealth—Varying desirability of property—Bodily labour not in itself an evil—Condition of the poor has really improved—The Rochdale co-operatives.

It is worth while perhaps, to run over the six last chapters, and to put together the more salient points. I will say no more of Proudhon's wilful sophistries or of Girardin's brilliant puerilities: but it is desirable to protest at least, against some of the more specious statements of St. Simon and Fourier and Louis Blanc.

I mentioned in my opening chapter, that these theorists object altogether to the present relation which exists between employers and workmen: that they regard it as a shameful thing for capitalists to look upon workmen as a means of earning an income for them; and that to *exploit* a band of servants as a mine or a field is *exploited*, is in their eyes a sordid and disgraceful proceeding. According to the French socialistic doctrines, all productions, since they are

results of labour, ought to belong to the labourers; and the income of a manufacturer is simply so much filched from his men.

Now a sound political economy teaches a very different doctrine. Capital, it says, is the result of self-denial and consequent accumulation; and as it in the first instance makes sustained labour possible, and afterwards renders it more efficacious, it is just as much entitled to a share of production as labour is. Take away the profit of the farmer, the manufacturer, the merchant, and the retailer, and capital would soon disappear, production would cease, the workman would starve, and the whole world would relapse into barbarism. •

Any one who opens his eyes to what is going on around him, must see how much advantage is derived by labourers from the presence of abundant capital; and therefore how much it is the interest even of labourers that capitalists should derive an income from their possessions.

I will mention as illustrations, two examples that occur to me. We have heard a great deal at different times about the subdivision of estates in France and other countries; and by many thoughtful and excellent persons it has been urged, that it would be of great service to our rural population, if we put small farms within their reach as an inducement to them to save and so better their condition. Men imbued with these notions, who have candour enough to admit that the splitting of French landed property has been carried

to a ruinous extent, and who lament that a peasant should be found cultivating for his livelihood a dozen minute gardens all separated from each other, and situated as islands in an ocean of other small properties, will yet contend that the careful peasant cultivation of Belgium is worthy of imitation. I would urge upon the attention of these excellent persons, this one simple fact.

During the frightful potato-failure of ten to twelve years ago, the horrible Irish famine was not the only unhappy consequence that followed. Belgium suffered also. And then was tested the boasted peasant cultivation: then were put to the proof the means possessed by these small farmers of bearing the strain of an unexpected dearth of food. The result was remarkable and instructive. The poor people, industrious as they are, habituated to unsparing work and ungrudging self-denial, are after all peasant cultivators, living almost from hand to mouth, earning their maintenance by hard labour, and owing very little to assistance derived from possession of any kind of stock. When their usual crops failed the owners had little resource. If an English farmer is deprived of his usual harvest, he can make shift, by his capital or his credit, to drag on to the next season, and the larger his capital the longer he can wait without ruin.

And mark the different results that follow as regards the labouring classes. In places where all the land is divided among peasant-proprietors, there are no persons of a higher class than that of the small farmers: but

where cultivation is conducted on a large scale, there are always farmers of considerable means, and generally landlords in addition. During a season of dearth in Flanders or Provence, the peasants must rub on as they can, without assistance of employer or landlord; for poor-rates are impossible where the applicants for aid would be the very persons to whom alone a tax-gatherer would apply. The result was painfully illustrated by the case to which I have alluded, of Belgium in 1848. The peasants, disappointed of their usual crops, and having no employers or patrons to stand between them and starvation, rushed in hosts to the towns, in hopes of extorting something from the charity or shame or fears of the citizens: and so extensive and alarming was the migration, that the Government felt it necessary to prohibit it; and stationed troops to keep back at the point of the bayonet these miserable fugitives from death. A frightful but needful severity. No one was surprised at the awful calamity of Ireland, of a country familiar with pestilence and famine; but the more enthusiastic and unreasoning believers in the peasant régime, must have been struck dumb by the spectacle exhibited in Belgium.

It is equally true I believe, that an abundant capital in the hands of a manufacturer, is of great service to workmen. I have been much struck with what I have noticed during the great slackness of trade of the past winter of 1857-58. In the instance of one poor family in particular, there has been a long-continued struggle

with utter destitution, and only just enough hope kept alive to restrain them from throwing themselves into the workhouse. One great cause of this deplorable poverty was volunteered to me by a looker-on, without any leading questions on my part. The father of the family had been in the habit of working for a near relation, who with scarcely any capital had kept up the name and appearance of a small master-manufacturer. In factories of larger means, efforts are commonly made to find some weekly employment for the hands: and this is done sometimes from a kindly feeling, but principally from a desire of keeping together the working corps in readiness for an improved season. Large stocks of goods are accumulated. But the weaker masters cannot do this however sympathetic and kindly they may be. A rich employer is therefore in many instances the greatest benefactor to his people; and it is highly discreditable to the socialistic party, that they should study to disguise this fact from the working classes, and should systematically hold up the capitalist to the hatred of his dependents, representing him as one who lives by filching his bread from the destitute.

The first distinguishing mark of a socialist then, is a hatred of capital and its owners: the second is an aversion to commercial competition. All must agree that competition has serious evils inseparable from its being. It is much to be regretted that there should be two shops side by side, both selling the same article, both empty half their time, and both requiring the constant attention of one or more people, who for hours

or days together are living in an enforced idleness. There would be a clear gain to the community if the two shops were amalgamated, and a number of the shopmen were set to other occupations. There is a great loss too, when in a town which can support only one daily paper, two are started, and for months together carry on a bitter struggle, which must end in an entire loss of the capital of the one, and a lamentable dissipation of the capital of the other.

It is not pleasant in the case of a manufacturer, who has a well-established business and an income which he spends honourably and liberally, to see an opposition spring up, caused perhaps by the illiberal rivalry of some sordid neighbour, who after a few years of vexatious interference retires from the field. Nor is it an agreeable thing for a master to be impoverished by the rivalry of men who have once been workmen or clerks in his service; especially if, as often happens, the change is of no advantage to the ambitious subordinates. So strongly was this felt by a merchant of my acquaintance, that at one period of his life he refused to deal with any house which had not attained to a certain standing; but the result, as might have been foretold, was that the mercantile business was in danger of ruin, and that without any considerable reduction of the evil. Any man may carry out such a rule as regards his private expenditure, unless indeed he is limited by a very narrow income. I know that a very conscientious lawyer of eminence, declines to buy his paper at a cheap shop, not exactly on the grounds I have mentioned

above, but rather lest he should become accessory to proceedings that might probably enough end in bankruptcy.

Competition therefore, brings with it many evils. And yet without it society would languish; the majority of men, freed from the lash and spur which now urge them on, and generally unfitted by nature or education for a higher career, would sink into apathy, or from a desire for excitement rush into vicious courses. The pursuit of wealth by honest industry, though it has nothing illustrious about it, is at any rate respectable.

We may say of competition, as of a system of government by party, that its stir and struggle and rivalry, though to some extent wasteful, and still further repugnant to men of pensive or contemplative minds, are far preferable to a careless and sleepy state of society. We may apply to these things the words of Erskine, and say that both are needed "to lash the lazy elements which without them would stagnate into pestilence." We may adopt the sentiments of Plutarch, without committing ourselves to his natural philosophy: "As the writers upon physics say, that if war and discord were banished the universe, the heavenly bodies would stop their course, and all generation and motion would cease, by reason of that perfect harmony; so the great Lawgiver (Lycurgus) infused a spirit of ambition and contention into the Spartan constitution, as an incentive to excellence, and wished always to see some difference and dispute among

the good and virtuous. He thought that general complaisance, which leads men to yield to the next proposal, without exploring each other's intentions, and without debating on the consequences, was an inert principle and deserved not the name of harmony." The old Spartan would doubtless have been much astonished to find his sentiments quoted in justification of anything so slavish as commerce; but had he lived in our days and been nurtured in our society, he would, I am persuaded, have been the first to protest against any projected arrangements which tended to lull the senses of ordinary men in indolence and sloth. He would have seen that competition is in every-day life, what party spirit is in the political world; a stimulus necessary to overcome the tendency of men to apathy and idleness.

If a pertinacious socialist were to press me hard with the question, how I could be content to sit down under the acknowledged evils of our present régime; I should give, in the first place, the trite but true answer, that every organization has its own ills: and in the second place, that we have every reason to hope that the evils of competition will be certainly, if slowly, corrected. I look for improvement from two sources: from a higher intellectual cultivation among all classes; and from an improvement in public opinion as to the pursuit of wealth.

The efforts which are being made to raise the tone of education among the middle classes, the distinct abandonment by our universities of the grinding of Latin

verse as the highest training of the immortal intellect, their recognition of an English education as an essential part of the formation of a gentleman, the patronage they are extending to natural philosophy and to the fine arts as pursuits worthy of being classed with the ancient studies of classical and mathematical learning; all these things, added to the impetus now in the process of being given to the grammar schools and proprietary colleges in every corner of the kingdom, by the liberal and earnest assistance tendered and accepted in the great towns; will, I am convinced, gradually abate the present undue competition, by taking off the keenness after wealth which is too characteristic of our trading classes. If we look around us, we shall find that it is not among our botanists, or geologists, or Alpine travellers, or amateur chemists, that we shall commonly see too great an addiction to a sordid following after gain. The higher and more liberal taste drives out or mitigates the inferior.

As to the second point I have alluded to, the improvement of public opinion, this will partly follow from an enlarged education. At present however, even accomplished and excellent persons have very indistinct notions about the morale of money-getting. Now you hear all industrial pursuits stigmatized as sordid; and again they are spoken of as honest or even honourable and praiseworthy. There is in truth a marked distinction between one man and another, even where both of them practise equal honesty and fair dealing. I do not mean that any preference is to be given of a

manufacturer over a merchant or a farmer, or of any one of these over a retailer or a government official. There is nothing in these pursuits at all incompatible with moral excellence.

The boundary line I would draw runs in quite a different direction. Few persons will doubt that a young man entering upon life, whether with small means or with a moderate provision, is called upon to adopt some mode of increasing his income; and that in order to secure to himself, and a probable family, such a competency as his birth and connections have made habitual to him, he is bound to make considerable sacrifices, even to the extent if need be, of exiling himself for years or for life. The man who will sit down contentedly, and without effort, on a straitened income, is no object of admiration to me: and the resolution of our countrymen to individually hold their own in society, is one of the causes of our national greatness. But I am not so well satisfied with the course commonly adopted by my compatriots later in life. If indeed their efforts have been unsuccessful, they are as much bound at sixty as at thirty, to toil and moil, to deny themselves, and to expatriate themselves if the interests of their families require it. But if fortune has been kind to them I cannot see the propriety of a continued and devoted worship.

I do not mean that as soon as a trader has acquired a moderate fortune he is bound to retire from business. If such a practice were to become general, we should be overrun with a multitude of men devoid of grave

occupation, and generally unfit for the adoption of any new and useful pursuit: while the sons of such men would often be deprived of the opportunity of succeeding to their fathers' practical experience. Nor do I imagine that society is the worse for possessing some members in the enjoyment of large incomes; especially, as it is found that wealthy traders are of all persons the most cheerful contributors to objects of public interest. But I do think that successful men frequently err greatly in urging on their trades or professions beyond their due limits. It seems to me inconsistent with generosity, and even with that regard which is justly due to one's neighbour, for a rich man to enter upon a new and untried course of adventure. Such a man, if he is at all right-minded, will of course avoid entering into competition with his son or his nephew; and I think he ought to abstain for similar reasons from rivalry in a new field with any other persons less fortunate than himself: and since in every career there are men to whom success is their life and being, a rich man should shrink from the danger of elbowing such men aside, and should confine himself to that department of industry of which he is already in possession.

One highly important principle seems constantly to escape the notice, not only of men of action, but even of moralists and economists: I mean, the very varying desirability of property, according to the situation of its possessor. To a man shipwrecked upon a barren coast a meal of coarse bread has an inestimable worth,

and would be gladly purchased with as much gold as would buy a waggon-load of flour at home. To a beginner in business a profit of a hundred pounds gives more pleasure, both as an earnest of success and as a means of future transactions, than a gain of a thousand pounds at a later period. A man filled with food who should carelessly take from the shipwrecked wretch his rude mouthful, would incur the reprobation of all civilized beings: the affluent man who by an ungenerous rivalry hinders the modest gains of the needy, is open to a similar censure.

The sentiments of universal humanity go with Nathan in his heavy condemnation of the churl, who spared to take of his own flocks and his own herds to give to the wayfaring man, but seized the solitary ewe lamb of the poor man in whose bosom it lay and to whom it was as a daughter. No doubt, many estimable people would be much astonished if I were to say to any one of them, thou art the man. The reply would be: far from crushing my neighbours, I have always held out my hand to help the struggling and to replace the fallen on his feet; and the income I have earned by honest application I have shared with those who needed aid. But I should urge upon such a respondent that this is not enough: that he should extend his regards to those who though standing well before the world, acknowledging no difficulties and seeking no assistance, have yet a long and fearful contest to maintain against the rivalry of their neighbours. In short, if our money-

getting classes would but learn moderation, there would be room for all to live and flourish. I only hope the time may come, when higher intellectual tastes and a more refined moral standard, may render him who though rich still grasps after more, as unpopular as the miser is at present. When that time comes, the great evils of competition will cease.

But besides the dissatisfaction I have mentioned as to the relation of employers and workmen, and also as to the results of modern competition among capitalists, there is at the bottom of many socialistic systems an exaggerated notion of the evils of bodily labour. This error, by no means confined to the teachers of socialism, is well exhibited in the following passage from M. Jean Reynaud's *Terre et Ciel*, p. 97, ed. 1854.

"This it is which draws from the brow of man that sweat of which the Old Testament makes mention. Willy nilly, under pain of death, shed it must be, for it is our life; and if we inspected our food closely, we should find it impregnated with human sweat. How much is shed, in how many places, from how many brows, in how many varying operations, for the creation of a single crust of bread! The detail is astounding, and gives us a vivid picture of the sad condition of man upon the earth, who cannot escape the torment of hunger but by voluntarily tormenting himself in a hundred other modes.

"Let us begin with the ploughman of land already cleared; let us remember the miner who tears from the

bowels of the earth the ore from which the forge supplies the ploughshare; the sower, the reaper, the thresher, the miller, the laborious and painful baker, the stoker and watcher of the oven. What multitudes tasked for this mouthful! Pursuing the analysis of all the labours it has caused, and of which we may regard it as the essence, we should find every kind of trade represented. What then would be the case if instead of limiting myself to a mere slice of bread, the necessary preventive of inanition, I had taken account of what is necessary for a competent meal! I should be sorry even at the most frugal table, to awaken the notion of the fatigue, of the exhaustion, of the various dangers, endured by sea and land, and even in the depths of the earth, for the production of that modest pleasure and good cheer which present themselves. I should fear to repress all joy and to transform into an abomination the most simple delicacies. Wherever luxury smiles, take off the mask and below there are faces that weep."

These sentiments (which I do not mean to represent as M. Reynaud's own) will ordinarily pass current in a sermon or a discourse on morals. People go away and say, how much are the industrial classes to be pitied! How grievous is the condition of man! To me no such ideas are conveyed by the spectacle of bodily toil, except in cases where there is a want of food and rest to restore the powers of the frame; and then, it is not the labour but the excess of it that I deplore. Far from regarding bodily ease as a condition of happiness,

I look upon exemption from daily labour as one of the misfortunes of the educated classes. I should indeed think it a great misfortune to be compelled to emigrate to Australia or Canada, and to have to submit to the coarse, rough-and-ready, money-getting spirit that seems inseparable from a new colony: but if anything could reconcile me to the change, it would be the necessity under which I should be placed of performing, without loss of caste, those laborious offices which the middle classes at home cannot well undertake. I almost share, at any rate I appreciate, the practical philosophy of the Lichfield philosopher; and when I see a servant girl cleaning the steps of a house or milking a cow, I half wish that it were feasible for ladies at home to do these things, as they needs must do them in a new country.

Mr. Day died in a laudable endeavour to accomplish what the American horsebreaker has done in safety. Had he lived to old age, the progress of colonization might have given him hopes of seeing his eccentric schemes realized. I so far sympathise with him as to believe that the necessity for bodily labour is no evil; and to be far from pitying those whom birth and education have fitted for regular manual employments. The irritation of an overlaboured brain, the weariness of idleness, the "rack of a too easy chair," the vapours of dyspepsia, the plague of indigestion, are ills of a far deeper dye than the daily toil of a farm servant, or the unceasing industry of a hard-working mechanic. As old Fletcher of Madeley says: the porter carries a load

on his back, the glutton carries a heavier one in his stomach.

Another and a much better founded complaint, is, that the wages earned by labourers are very often insufficient to furnish themselves and their families with the necessaries of life: meaning by this term, whatever is needful for health and vigour of body. It is certainly an apparently lamentable thing, that in the same nation, at the same moment, one man should laboriously earn half a crown a day, while his neighbour of the same clay and of no higher virtue than himself, is in the receipt of a hundred or a thousand pounds a day, without effort. This evil however is not a very real one. But it is a real and a crying evil, a canker in the face of society, that a family, that thousands and tens of thousands of families, should pass their lives earning a bare subsistence by each day's work, and should go through the world perpetually on the verge of destitution.

Of the social truths however, that have been investigated during the last fifty years, none has been more clearly established than this: that the destiny of the working classes is principally in their own hands, and that without industry, frugality, and self-restraint, on their part, no measures of Government, no organization of society, can raise their condition; from which it follows, that it is not to the direct action of legislation on wages and charitable relief, but to an improvement of the men themselves, that we must look for amelioration.

But in the present century praiseworthy efforts have been made to elevate the intellect and the moral tone of the poor: and the momentous question arises: has their material condition improved in proportion? It is a favourite assertion of many enthusiasts, that as the rich have become richer the poor have become poorer; and the proposition is thought to be fully established, when from the squalid depths of London or Liverpool, the distresses of the needlewomen, or the appalling vices of the *prolétaires*, are dragged forth to scare the eye of day: as though destitution and vice were something new. Let such unthinking partisans read Scott and Smollett and the graver pages of Mandeville: the *Fortunes of Nigel* and the *Fable of the Bees* will supply information they much need.

And if it is not true that crime and want are creations of recent days, neither is it true that the condition of the decent workman has deteriorated: indeed it is quite certain that it has improved. The wages of an unskilled labourer in a flourishing town, were a hundred years ago eight shillings; they are now fifteen shillings. The wages of a ploughman a hundred years ago were five to six shillings; they are now ten to thirteen shillings. Bread, the main article of consumption, has no doubt risen; but it has not doubled as wages have. During the first half of last century, the price of wheat is set down in the ordinary averages at about 40s., imperial measure. It would be a bold farmer who would take a lease for twenty years on the calculation that the averages will be 60s. during that future

period. Wheat then, is not worth half as much more as it was worth a hundred years ago; yet wages have doubled.

Malthus fifty years ago, reckoned a peck of wheat an ample wage for a day's labour. If we calculate a peck of wheat as now commonly worth 1s. 9d. (at 56s. a quarter) a labourer would get liberal wages according to Malthus, if he earned 10s. 6d. a week, and we see that most of our labourers earn much more. It must be remembered that the great writer on 'population' was most earnest in maintaining the necessity of a high standard of comfort and of wages. It seems then, that our present rate of country wages is as high, and generally higher, than was thought necessary by a warm friend to a liberal remuneration: and that our town labourers live in a state which our ancestors would have denominated luxury.

The case I believe may be put still more strongly in our favour. The invention of steam engines, and other causes, have considerably lowered the expense of converting grain into bread: and this saving is so great that it far more than counterbalances the loss from the inferiority of our wheat compared with that of our progenitors. This explains the fact recorded in M'Culloch's prices, that from 1729 to 1765 Greenwich Hospital paid at the rate of $5\frac{1}{2}d.$ for the quartern loaf, whereas with the same range of prices of wheat, the quartern loaf now would not cost in the great towns out of London more than $4\frac{1}{2}d.$ to $5d.$ Or in another point of view:

there is no apparent probability that the quartern loaf of pure white bread will cost during the next twenty years more than $6\frac{1}{2}d.$ on the average; the cost a hundred years ago was $5\frac{1}{2}d.$: if then the $6s.$ wages of that period had risen to $7s. 3d.$, they would have risen as much as bread has: but they have risen from $6s.$ to $11s.$ or $12s.$; town wages have followed the same proportion.

The result of this inquiry is to me very satisfactory. It is true that it is an inscrutable mystery to me how a family can live on $12s.$ a week: but then it is nearly as inexplicable how they can exist on $15s.$ a week; though I was a little enlightened by reading in Sir F. Eden the calculation of the expenses of a Cambrian peasant, because I found that the man could get his bellyful of victuals for just $3d.$ a day. The pleasure I feel arises from my finding, that small as are the means of the working classes, they have improved and therefore give hopes of further improvement. If I had arrived at the reverse conclusion, if I had found that labourers are now worse paid than they were formerly, I should have nearly despaired of our present organization, and I should have listened with more patience to novel schemes.

While I was writing the latter part of this volume, I became acquainted with a little book, containing an account of *Co-operation in Rochdale*, by G. J. Holyoake; and I would strongly recommend it to persons interested in the welfare of the working classes. It shows how

the Rochdale weavers have succeeded by mutual help in considerably bettering their condition. The members began by subscribing 2*d.* a week, which they afterwards increased to 3*d.*; and when they had accumulated 28*l.* they began to make purchases of commodities for the general benefit of the subscribers.

I am far from looking with dislike or contempt on such a project as this, regarded as subsidiary to, and not as a substitute for, our present arrangements. The members began with a certain exercise of self-denial as a means of accumulating a little capital: in the second place, all the officers of the society performed their labour at first without any charge, and this is a valuable development of disinterestedness: thirdly, they have a rule that all their transactions shall be for ready money; an excellent corrective for the abuses of credit: fourthly, there is a public opinion created which tends to check every excess among the members. For myself I rejoice that working men should meet together for the promotion of any legitimate object common to them all. Indeed, though my interest might lead me to deprecate Trades' Unions and strikes, which have often caused me losses, I have long been a convert to the opinion (and I have declared this in print) that mechanics are wise to enter into such unions and occasionally to have resort to strikes.

But I am far from believing that co-operative societies are likely to supersede our present social arrangements. I regard them as altogether of a temporary nature; and

I am convinced that when any of the members of the *Rochdale Equitable Pioneers* arrive at a certain grade of affluence, they will find it more convenient, and more gainful, to carry on their transactions by the ordinary machinery of individual capitalist and labourer,

THE END.